FBIS DAILY REPORT

CONTENTS

Soviet Union

Vol III No 222 *18 Nov 85*

REPORTAGE ON REAGAN-GORBACHEV SUMMIT MEETING

Reagan Meet in Geneva by Swiss Officials 1
Gorbachev Arrives, Makes Statement at Airport 1
Departure From Moscow 1
TV Report on Departure 1
Arrival in Geneva 1
Arrival Statement 1
Moscow Accepts 'Principle' of Future Summit *[Paris]* 2
Zamyatin Remark *[TANJUG]* 2
Shishlin Reports Leak of Weinberger Letter 2
Speakes Cited on Agenda for Summit Talks 2
Officials Present Soviet Views to Press 2
Arbatov Discusses Expectations 3
Links With Israel Denied 3
16 November Conference *[Shishkovskiy, Dmitriyev, Kolyagin]* 4
17 November Conference *[Zorin, Kalyagin, Kondratyev]* 5
Participants on Arms Proposals *[Ivanov, Lopatin]* 6
Different Approaches Noted *[Shishlin]* 7
Zamyatin Remarks 7
Sagdeyev Urges Renunciation *[Kalyagin]* 8
Gen Maksimov Views Stances 8
'Political Realities' of SDI *[Arbatov in IZVESTIYA 16 Nov]* 9
Soviet, U.S. Space Weapons Stances Contrasted *[Kondratyev in PRAVDA 16 Nov]* 10
Space Weapons Ban Will Solve 'Dilemma' *[PRAVDA 16 Nov]* 12
Links Between SDI, Europe's Eureka Noted *[Bovin]* 12
W. Europe Sees Talks of 'Paramount' Importance 13
Draft UN Resolution Vote Shows U.S. 'Hypocrisy' 14
U.S. Brings 'Empty' Diplomatic Portfolio *[Zorin]* 14
PRAVDA Discusses Geneva Summit Prospects *[Kurdyumov, 17 Nov]* 15
'International Panorama' Previews Talks *[Bovin]* 17
Bolshakov Calls for 'Wisdom' at Geneva *[PRAVDA 18 Nov]* 18
PRAVDA Reports on Lead-up to Geneva Summit *[Dubrovin, Kolesnichenko, 17 Nov]* 21

Reagan Met in Geneva by Swiss Officials

LD170154 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0142 GMT 17 Nov 85

[Text] Geneva, 17 Nov (TASS) — Ronald Reagan, the President of the United States, arrived in Geneva on Saturday evening in order to take part in the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting. At the airport he was met by Furgler, president of the Swiss Confederation, and by other officials.

Gorbachev Arrives, Makes Statement at Airport

Departure From Moscow

LD180813 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0749 GMT 18 Nov

[Text] Moscow, 18 Nov (TASS) — M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, today left Moscow for Geneva for his meeting with U.S. President R. Reagan.

The offical party which left with M.S. Gorbachev to take part in the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting comprises: E.A. Shevardnadze, member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee, USSR minister of foreign affairs; G.M. Korniyenko, first deputy USSR minister of foreign affairs; A.F. Dobrynin, USSR ambassador to the United States; A.N. Yakovlev, head of the Propaganda Department of the CPSU Central Committee; L.M. Zamyatin, head of the International Information Department of the CPSU Central Committee; and A.M. Aleksandrov, assistant to the general sceretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

M.S. Gorbachev was seen off at the airport by the Members of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo: G.A. Aliyev, V.I. Vorotnikov, V.V. Grishin, A.A. Gromyko, Ye.K. Ligachev, N.I. Ryzhkov, M.S. Solomentsev, V.M. Cherbikov; by the Candidate Members of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo P.N. Demichev, V.I. Dolgikh, V.V. Kuznetsov, B.N. Ponomarev, S.L. Sokolov, N.V. Talyzin; by the Secretaries of the CPSU Central Committee B.N. Yeltsin, L.N. Zaykov, M.V. Zimyanin, I.V. Kapitonov, V.P. Nikonov, K.V. Rusakov; and by other comrades.

Among those who saw him off were the temporary charges d'affaires of the United States in the USSR, R. Combs, and of Switzerland in the USSR (M. von Gruenigen).

TV Report on Departure

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 0807 GMT on 18 November broadcasts the departure of Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, for the Geneva summit. The camera shows a group walking from the airport buildings toward the aircraft.

Shown in the front row, from left to right are: Ligachev, Gorbachev, Gromyko, and Shevardnadze, followed by Vorotnikov, Aliyev, Solomentsev, Raisa Gorbacheva, Grishin, Chebrikov, and Rusakov. Visible behind them are Ponomarev, Sokolov (in uniform), Dolgikh, Kuznetsov, and Talyzin. The party is then shown standing near the aircraft.

A medium shot of the line-up waving good-bye to Gorbachev shows the following, from left to right: Kapitonov, Demichev, Ponomarev, Vorotnikov, some unidentified individuals, then Solomentsev and Chebrikov. Raisa Gorbacheva is shown in the first line-up, but not in the second. The camera then shows Gorbachev waving from the aircraft steps followed by a shot of the aircraft taxiing down the runway and taking off.

A final shot shows the send-off party waving from the airport building entrance.

Arrival in Geneva

LD181054 Moscow TASS in English 1048 GMT 18 Nov 85

[Text] Geneva, November 18 TASS — Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, arrived in Geneva today for a meeting with U.S. President Ronald Reagan.

At the airport, where the state flags of the USSR and Switzerland were hoisted, Mikhail Gorbachev was welcomed by President Kurt Furgler of the Swiss Confederation and other officials.

Arrival Statement

LD181138 Moscow TASS in English 1136 GMT 18 Nov 85

[Text] Geneva, November 18 TASS — Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, made the following statement at the airport upon his arrival in Geneva today:

"Esteemed Mr. President,

Esteemed ladies and gentlemen,

Thank you, Mr. President, for your kind words addressed to us. They, I think, reflect the character of the relations existing between our countries and peoples.

We are glad to step onto the soil of Geneva. Your remarkable city has many times over the centuries extended hospitality to champions of enlightenment, progress, peace and freedom.

Nowadays Geneva has become the venue of numerous forums of international cooperation.

The status of permanent neutrality chosen by Switzerland undoubtedly adds to her tangible contribution to the development of international relations. The Soviet Union has always respected this status and will continue to do so."

"This time Geneva, with the courteous consent of the Swiss Government, has been chosen the venue of the meeting of the leaders of the Soviet Union and the United States of America. This meeting is to discuss major questions the solution of which will be very important to the further progress of international affairs as a whole, primarily the question of what can be done to stop the unprecedented arms race which has unfolded in the world, to prevent it from spreading into new areas, to avert thethreat of nuclear war from mankind, and to secure peace and

further fruitful cooperation among nations.

The peoples of the Soviet Union and the United States of America, the peoples of the other countries of the world are expecting positive results from the Geneva meeting.

I can assure you that we for our part will be seeking precisely such an outcome of this important meeting.

Thank you again, Mr. President, for this courteous welcome."

Moscow Accepts 'Principle' of Future Summit

LD172059 Paris Domestic Service in French 2000 GMT 17 Nov 85

[Excerpt] According to TF-1, the French television first channel, the Soviets have reportedly accepted the principle of a new summit next year if talks between the two leaders prove to be inconclusive.

Zamyatin Remark

LD172100 Belgrade TANJUG Domestic Service in Serbo-Croatian 2015 GMT 17 Nov 85

[Text] Paris, 17 Nov (TANJUG) — Referring to information from the circles of the Soviet delegation in Geneva, a special reporter of the French TV Channel 1 tonight reported that on principle there has already been a proposal on the second meeting between Gorbachev and Reagan. This information was allegedly confirmed to the French journalist by Soviet representative Zamyatin who said that the new Soviet-U.S. summit should be held as early as next year.

Shishlin Reports Leak of Weinberger Letter

LD172016 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1900 GMT 17 Nov 85

[Report from Geneva by international affairs journalist Nikolay Shishlin]

[Text] Yesterday I had the opportunity to drive through the city of Geneva and, in particular, to have a look at the Intercontinental Hotel occupied by the U.S. group. On the building there is a greeting in connection with the forthcoming Soviet-U.S. summit and a little dove, symbolizing the peaceful U.S. intentions. Well, both this greeting and this little dove found themselves undoubtedly seriously clouded by the message from the U.S. Secretary of Defense, Weinberger, to U.S. President Reagan published in *THE NEW YORK TIMES* newspaper. Its content is more than expressive. This letter, which, it is believed, was leaked as a result of some violation of discipline in the U.S. machinery of state, claims that the Soviet Union allegedly is perpetrating violations of the SALT II treaty and that these violations demand from the U.S. side an appropriate reaction in response.

But this is only one accusation. The main thing, as a matter of fact, is the considerations set forth to his chief by the U.S. secretary of defense. In particular, the secretary objects to compliance with the provisions of the SALT II treaty. Secondly, he resolutely protests against any limitations on research, innovations [razrabotki], and tests within the framework of the so-called Strategic Defense Initiative of space-strike weapons. Further, Weinberger insists that no communique and no statement of even the most general nature should be adopted with the Soviet Union.

And, of course, lots of questions arise here at once. Is this really such an accidental leak of this very important letter or is it something else? Well, it is reported here that President Reagan was incensed with the fact that this letter was leaked to the press.

But, accidental or not, a letter from the U.S. defense secretary has found itself in the press. And it is clear that there are certain circles in the United States who are seeking to put on all the brakes in order not to permit a positive outcome to the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting.

At a news conference today by McFarlane, the President's assistant for national security, most of the time was spent on somehow disassociating from these claims by the Pentagon chief. In a word, the kettle of political passions is seething in Geneva and guesswork continues to increase regarding the outcome of the Geneva meeting. The U.S. readiness to travel its part of the road to the achievement of mutually acceptable accords with the Soviet Union will be verified in deed, actions, and conduct.

Speakes Cited on Agenda for Summit Talks

LD181244 Moscow TASS in English 1240 GMT 18 Nov 85

[Text] Geneva, November 18 TASS — Larry Speakes, head of the White House press service, briefed journalists at the U.S. press centre in Hotel Intercontinental in the morning today. He said that the American-Soviet summit will discuss four questions, namely, arms control, regional problems, bilateral relations and human rights. The results of the meeting should be judged not by tomorrow's newspaper headings but by the development of relations for months and years to come. If a stabler peace can be established depends on these results, whereas the foundations for such peace have been laid and we are ready for a fresh start.

The President approaches the meeting realistically, without any illusions about the differences dividing the United States and the Soviet Union, Speakes said. But we believe that there are grounds for optimism on the eve of the summit. The President goes to tomorrow's meeting from positions of strength and with a sense of historical perspective. We will seek a more realistic dialogue with the Soviet Union not on the basis of presumptions which have proved impracticable but with the belief that we will be able to work more closely together. We are seeking a stable, constructive and predictable development of relationships.

Officials Present Soviet Views to Press

Arbatov Discusses Expectations

LD151818 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 15 Nov 85

[From the "Vremya" newscast; Academician Georgiy Arkadiyevich Arbatov response to question by "special correspondent" Valentin Zorin in the Geneva press center — live or recorded]

[Text] [Zorin] For several decades the city on the banks of Lake Geneva has been considered one of the political centers of the world. This can be felt in particular at present, in late autumn 1985.

Geneva is currently attracting the attention of the entire world; and although there are still a few days to go before the start of the meeting between Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and President Reagan, a large number of prominent politicians, public figures, scientists, and of course journalists have already arrived. We are now in the Geneva press center, talking to Academician Georgiy Arkadiyevich Arbatov.

Georgiy Arkadiyevich, you have spent several days here and have had many meetings and talks with colleagues and representatives of the press. How would you answer the question: What is to be expected of the forthcoming Geneva meeting?

[Arbatov] The closer the meeting gets, of course, the more numerous are the expectations and hopes connected with it, in spite the fact that the Americans are presently attempting — this is evident from the press and even from the questions posed to our comrades during interviews, and a lot of interviews are being given at the moment — by all possible means to play down these expectations, to lower the expectations; that is, to prepare for the possibility of the meeting ending in nothing at all, or in some sort of empty conversation, some sort of gesture. Well, now, to me, this does not seeem to be helpful.

In general the meeting is growing into something more important than the Americans and many others evidently expected at the time the meeting was conceived and preparations for it began. It is linked with wholly understandable, objective matters: the threat is growing and we are approaching the point of no return, as they say in the air forces — that is, the point from which there can be no return — first and foremost, in connection with the development of new means of mass destruction. I mean here primarily "star wars," the Strategic Defense Initiative.

But you know, I think that these moods — you know, everything occurring in connection with the meeting: the policy which the Soviet Union conducted before this, of course, the completely simple policy of ceasing nuclear tests, the proposal for halving strategic offensive weapons — the weapons that can reach the other country, that is — yes, well, this entire line has made this meeting unique. [as heard] That is, everyone hopes and expects that the meeting will end in success, in the sense of a positive agreement which would start a movement, a turning point of some sort, would start a movement away from this so-called second world war, this wholly unrestricted arms race, towards normalization and reduction of armaments, towards normal peace.

On the other hand, however, even if this does not happen, the meeting will nevertheless be very important — important as a moment of truth; because at this meeting it will become quite clear what the Americans have brought with them, to what extent one can deal with them in this world as a whole, how far their policy corresponds with reality. And I think this, too: If they really do not budge from their position and do not take up a position which corresponds to the reality in the world, this will also be very important, because it is a very important matter to shatter the illusions which have been spread for so long. This is the prerequisite for an agreement. You know, as in medicine, the correct diagnosis of an illness is the guarantee of success of the treatment.

It seems to me that it is this which defines the atmosphere, what people are feeling and aware of in Geneva, and, I think, not just in Geneva alone.

Links With Israel Denied

LD151517 Kuwait KUNA in English 1317 GMT 15 Nov 85

[Text] Geneva, Nov 15 (KUNA) — The Soviet Union Friday dismissed any possibility of an early restoration of diplomatic links with the Jewish state.

At a press conference here a team of Soviet officials briefing journalists about the forthcoming superpowers summit was asked about recent speculation over diplomatic ties.

The Soviet officials said that "speculation is the right word".

"There was no possibility of the establishment of diplomatic ties with Israel while it continued in its aggressive policies towards neighbouring countries", they added.

It was "difficult to conceive" how the Soviet Union could reinstitute links because of this, they stressed.

The Soviet Union has sent a 12-strong team of state officials and leading academics to Geneva in advance of the summit next week to brief the media on their country's policy positions.

Regional questions like the problem of the Jewish state, tensions in Central America and Southeast Asia are provisionally due to be discussed on the second day of the summit, next Wednesday.

The press conference this morning was the first to have been given by the Soviet team.

During the course of the hour-long briefing, a number of Zionists attempted to disrupt proceedings, waving a poster and repeatedly trying to monopolise the questioning.

At the conference the officials outlined basic Soviet positions on nuclear weapons limitation, and stressed there had been no

softening in its absolute rejection of any attempt to militarise outer space, which they said the U.S. wanted to do with its "star wars" programme.

The Soviet side was coming to Geneva "for serious and productive work, and we are not coming with our hands empty".

The officials were asked whether Mikhail Gorbachev had been preparing for the summit by watching films of his opponent Ronald Reagan, as the American has reportedly been doing.

They replied that unlike Reagan, whose attention span was said in the press to have been limited to 10-minute periods of video clips, the Soviet leader did not need any special preparations.

"Anyway, all the Reagan films are B-rated", one Soviet official quipped, in a reference to the American leader's previous career as a low-ranking Hollywood actor.

16 January Conference

LD162128 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 16 Nov 85

[From the "Vremya" newscast; correspondents V. Shishkovskiy, V. Dmitriyev, and B. Kolyagin report from Geneva]

[Excerpt] [Shishkovskiy] A press conference of eminent Soviet public figures, scientists, and writers has been held at the Geneva press center. It has evoked great interest among journalists from many countries of the world who are here. Reference was made to regional problems. The participants in the press conference set out the Soviet position on these questions and exposed the slander and speculation which has emerged in the bourgeois press.

[Zorin] It should be pointed out that not everyone who has come to Geneva in these last few days has done so with pure intentions, so to speak. There are those who have evidently made it their purpose to poison the atmosphere around the Soviet-U.S. meeting as much as they can. They are spreading provocative rumors and are asking deliberately stupid and absurd questions at the press conferences and are writing off the meeting in advance.

One need hardly be surprised at this. Relaxation of international tension and improving the climate in the world, a thing which the peoples are thirsting for, is literally sheer hell for those who have made the arms race a goldmine for themselves. There is no need particularly to guess what, for example, the Board of Directors of the Boeing company, one of the Pentagon's main supplies of military equipment, thinks of the meeting in Geneva. Or the board of the Lockheed concern, which earned $570 million also last year alone, and the boards of several dozens of other military-industrial corporations in the United States.

And yet, the realities of the present century are stronger than the greed of the death merchants. That is why the Geneva meeting has become possible, and that is why hopes are being laid throughout the world for the beginning of a Soviet-U.S. dialogue.

[Kalyagin] These last few days in Geneva there have been press conferences, and briefings and discussions are being arranged. The group of Soviet experts, which includes well-knwon scientists and public figures, is enjoying great popularity among correspondents.

Each of them is asked to give several interviews every day for foreign television companies, newspapers, and news agencies. The public is concerned as to how ready the sides are for reaching a mutually acceptable accord. Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's words that the Soviet Union comes out in favor of the meeting really helping toward a solution to the central issues of our time have won wide approval here.

As we have already reported, a meeting with the press was held at the Geneva press center by three Soviet scientists — Academicians Velikhov, Arbatov, and Sagdeyev. It aroused increased interest in journalistic circles. Our representatives set out the Soviet Union's position on questions of the nonmilitarization of outer space and nuclear arms limitation.

The press conference was opened by Velikhov, vice president of the USSR Academy of Sciences.

[Begin recording] [Velikhov] The question of deploying strike weapons in outer space is becoming considerably more a matter of principle. It embraces not only questions of the so-called strategic initiative, but also embraces in principle the closing of all possible ways toward deploying weapons in space.

Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev said during his meeting that Soviet people react in a very negative way to the possibility which would occur if these channels were not closed; because, as a result of the appearance of weapons in space, what would the world really come to in 10 or 20 years? Because, over our heads, over your heads, over the heads of all people in the world, weapons, terrible weapons, would be moving around incessantly in outer space. We might call them by different names, but they would still be weapons and they would fill up all levels, starting from low orbits and ending with geostationary orbits.

[Sagdeyev] The new strategic concept that the U.S. Administration is now putting forward is, by its very nature, completely and utterly counter to the ABM Treaty of 1972. Then the question arises: At what point do specific steps in the implementation of this concept start to run directly counter to individual points of the treaty? This question has also been debated and discussed, and here our position is also absolutely clear.

[Arbatov] I think that the main thing that the two powers can do in this matter is, mainly, to halt the arms race and to begin a reduction in nuclear weapons. And the other nuclear powers must join in this, too. There is a specific field connected with nonproliferation. No one has ever reproached the Soviet Union for showing even the slightest lack of care in this matter. We have been as strict as it is possible to be in fulfilling all our commitments with regard to the nonproliferation treaty. Should the arms race continue in the same way, should the same exacerbations continue, should weapons be stockpiled — then this will inevitably lead some day to a catastrophe. We have been saying this all the time, and that is why we believe this meeting to be extremely timely and important, a meeting which will occur at a truly critical time, when there is an opportunity to leave this genie in

the bottle, and not to let a genie of a new extremely dangerous spiral of the arms race out of the bottle. [end recording]

17 January Conference

LD172230 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 17 Nov 85

[From the "Vremya" newscast; report from Geneva by correspondents V. Zorin, B. Kalyagin, and V. Kondratyev; individual correspondents not identified]

[Excerpts] The time until the start of the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting, initially counted in months, then in weeks, is now counted in hours. Last night President Reagan arrived in Geneva. U.S. journalists said that his arrival in good time was connected with doctors' demands and the need for rest after the flight.

On the eve of the meeting, the public is alarmed by the U.S. side's position, and so the first news conference which was organized today by the U.S. delegation was fairly stormy. Most of the questions asked went without an intelligible answer. Incidentally, ironic remarks by journalists were provoked by the fact that the United States has decided to dispense with the common international press center and has set up their own in the banquet hall of the plush Intercontinental Hotel. Will that help? The main thing is not the entourage but what the U.S. delegation has come to Geneva with.

And its political luggage can largely be judged from the U.S. counterproposals, distributed by the U.S. press service for discussion during the coming summit-level conference.

In this connection the numerous corps of journalists here were especially interested in the news conference given today by experts from the Soviet delegation. This news conference was devoted to the key problem which Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and President Reagan have to discuss, the problem of halting the arms race on earth and preventing its spread into space. In his speech, chief of directorate of the General Staff of the Armed Forces of the USSR, Colonel General Chervov, presented in detail the Soviet proposals on reducing nuclear missile armaments and permitting [as heard] the militarization of space. Concerning the U.S. counterproposals, General Chervov said, among other things:

[Begin Chervov recording] As for the U.S. counterproposals presented at the Geneva talks, which have now been distributed here at the press center, we are seriously studying them. But I can only say that under the U.S. proposals, there would effectively be not a reduction but a build-up of strategic offensive armaments on the U.S. side to approximately 15,000 nuclear warheads, while on the side of the Soviet Union there would be 6,000 nuclear warheads. The arithmetic is quite simple: The balance of forces is extremely clear. Under the U.S. proposals all the U.S. military programs are maintained, while the Soviet Union must break up its strategic nuclear forces and rebuild them to the U.S. pattern. Briefly, the sides' positions remain, as before, fundamentally different. [end recording]

Col Gen Chervov went on to say that the chief flaw in the U.S. proposals was the fact that they evade the key, fundamental question of nonmilitarization of space.

[Begin Chervov recording] It is unrealistic to hope for the implementation of any deep cuts in strategic offensive weapons. Such reductions would be both senseless and dangerous in conditions when the United States is trying, via space, to obtain a decisive military superiority over the Soviet Union and acquire for itself the capability of dealing a first nuclear strike with impunity. [end recording]

Lately a letter has fallen in journalists' hands sent by Pentagon boss Weinberger to President Reagan on the eve of his flight to Geneva. This letter occupies three pages of typed text, but its essence can be boiled down to one little line: No to the Soviet proposals. Answering a question from one of the correspondents regarding Weinberger's letter, Academician Arbatov said, among other things:

[Begin Arbatov recording] Weinberger has openly said what we were suspecting all the time: that an influential group in the U.S. Government wants to destroy the whole structure of agreements on arms limitation which are in existence, and liquidate even those modest limitations in order to obtain full freedom of action in the arms race. I think that this confirms also that the members of the delegation who were with Mr Shultz in Moscow had no reason to be offended when they were told in Moscow that, in our opinion, U.S. policy is strongly influenced by very conservative circles and the military-industrial complex. And the statement by Weinberger, who is one of the chief members of the Cabinet, fully confirms this, I think. [end recording]

People are tired of the brandishing of weapons and militant slogans; they want peace and security. And so they wish the summit success, expressing good wishes to its participants.

Back in Geneva: At the USSR Consulate General, the ceremonial handing-over of a message to Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev sent by the international children's organization, Birds of Peace, took place. Taking part in the ceremony were young envoys from 18 countries. On behalf of general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, the message was received by the representative of the Soviet delegation, Comrade Zamyatin.

[Begin Zamyatin recording] Allow me to thank you for coming to us and for bringing your warm, cordial letters. We all understand them. I accept your letters and will hand them to general secretary of our party's Central Committee, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, who is coming to Geneva tomorrow, so that he too may know that your movement of children and pupils are also taking part in the mighty antiwar movement, as are your letters and actions expressing the united will that peace may be preserved on earth. That is our common cause, the common cause of all: to preserve peace so that you may live on when you grow up, in conditions of peace and may never know what war is. [end recording]

Many notable events have taken place in the past decades in Geneva, and yet the coming Soviet-U.S. summit is seen as a

specially important event. In foreign policy, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev said recently, now the destiny of each nation, each person, be he an ordinary citizen or a political leader, is being decided. This is what determines the significance of the coming Soviet-U.S. dialogue, and that is why the gaze of the whole world is drected to Geneva now.

Participants on Arms Proposals

LD171956 Moscow TASS in English 1940 GMT 17 Nov 85

[Text] Geneva, November 17 TASS — TASS correspondents Yevgeniy Ivanov and Yuriy Lopatin report:

A meeting of a group of prominent Soviet scientists and experts with mass media men who arrived in Geneva from many countries to cover the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting took place at the International Press Centre here today.

Academician Georgiy Arbatov, Academician Yevgeniy Velikhov, Colonel General Nikolay Chervov and others touched upon matters aimed at curbing the arms race and on the new Soviet initiatives which are directed towards prevention of the deployment of striking forces in outer space and towards a radical, 50-per cent, reduction in the USSR's and the USA's nuclear systems capable of reaching each other's territory.

The universal task is to stop the arms race and to start disarmament without delay and to normalize the international situation, Soviet scientists and experts stated. The Soviet Union directs all its efforts towards the attainment of these goals which are served by the USSR's unilateral steps: the moratoriumon the deployment of its medium-range missiles in Europe; the removal from the stand-by alert of the SS-20 missiles which were additionally deployed in the European zone from June 1984 in reply to the deployment of U.S. Pershing-2 and cruise missiles; all the SS-5 medium-range missiles have been destroyed, and SS-4 missiles are being discarded; a moratorium on any nuclear explosions has been announced to remain in effect until January 1, 1986.

Subordinated to these goals are other Soviet foreign-policy initiatives and practical steps including the forthcoming meeting between Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and President Ronald Reagan of the United States. In preparation for the meeting the USSR has submitted new proposals — constructive and quite tangible by their significance — to the U.S. Government for consideration.

As regards strategic offensive and space arms, the USSR has suggested to the USA to agree on full ban on space strike weapons and on a really radical, 50 per cent, reduction in the appropriate nuclear weapons capable of reaching each other's territory.

On the USSR'S part these are all strategic offensive arms: intercontinental ballistic missiles, submarine-launched ballistic missiles, and heavy bombers — a total of 2,504 units. The Soviet Union has no other nuclear systems capable of reaching U.S. territory.

The United States, apart from strategic offensive arms (2,215 units), has medium-range weapons and forward-based systems capable of reaching the USSR's territory. Belonging to them are medium-range missiles and aircraft, including tactical and carrier-based aircraft — a total of 1,149 units. So, the aggregate number of systems subject to reduction on the U.S. side is 3,364.

At the same time the Soviet Union and the United States would come to terms on having an equal number of nuclear warheads — 6,000 — for the nuclear weapons delivery vehicles which would remain after the 50 per cent cutback (1,250 in the Soviet Union and 1,680 in the United States). THE USSR is prepared to do that, bearing in mind that an approximate strategic balance would be ensured thereby.

The Soviet proposal can be realized only provided an accord is reached on full ban on space strike weapons. The proposal is a fair one and ensures equal security for the USSR and the USA.

The USSR's territory is under a double threat on the part of U.S. strategic nuclear systems as well as U.S. medium-range systems (forward-based ones). The Soviet Union cannot remain indifferent to this double threat.

Along with the radical reduction the Soviet side suggests to the USA to renounce the programmes aimed at creating and deploying new strategic offensive arms; to reduce to the maximum the modernization of the existing ones; fully ban long-range cruise missiles of all basing modes; stop all work for the creation of space strike weapons; stop the testing and deployment of new kinds and types of nuclear arms; to stop the deployment of medium-range missiles in Europe. The USSR suggests removing from the stand-by alert a certain percentage or number of strategic offensive arms of the sides and on a mutual basis by an agreed-upon date (for example, to dismantle 200-300 intercontinental ballistic missiles on each side).

As regards medium-range nuclear arms in Europe, the USSR suggests concluding a separate agreement. Such an approach meets the wishes of the West Europeans, thereby taking into account most directly the interests of their security.

The termination of further deployment of medium-range missiles in Europe and a sharp reduction in their number within a comparatively short period of time down to an agreed-upon level should be the content of such an agreement between the USSR and the USA. At the same time talks on a more radical solution could be continued. In reducing to naught the number of Soviet and U.S. medium-range missiles in Europe, the USSR would be prepared to have the same number of missiles here as Britain and France have, judging by the number of warheads. The USSR is ready to free Europe from nuclear weapons altogether — from both medium-range and tactical ones — on a reciprocal basis. The Soviet Union has thus put forward a whole package of far-reaching constructive measures and this has been done on the basis of taking into account honestly and objectively the security interests of both the United States and West European countries. A fundamentally new situation has developed, Soviet scientists and experts emphasize.

The USSR through its proposals strives to ensure the favourable-to-the-utmost prerequisites for getting the process of talks in

Geneva moving and for reaching respective accords. Their realisation would mean a fundamental change in the development of international relations in favour of strengthening peace, security and cooperation and a big step on the way to full elimination of nuclear weapons.

How do the United States react to the Soviet constructive actions? Unfortunately, there is no constructiveness on the USA's part.

The USA hurries to deploy as many "Pershing-2" and cruise missiles in Europe as possible (218 of them have been deployed now, including 90 Pershing-2 and 128 cruise missiles; by the end of the year there will be 108 Pershing-2 missiles and a much larger number of cruise missiles); it is working in a speeded up way on the "star wars" programme, creating a new class of armaments — space strike systems; nuclear explosions are conducted in the USA one after another; strategic offensive arms are being built up, and first-strike nuclear systems are being created.

As far as the U.S. counter-proposals presented at the talks in Geneva are concerned, they are being seriously studied in the Soviet Union. One can only say that under the U.S. counter-proposals (in the event of their realisation), there would be not a reduction but a build-up of nuclear warheads on strategic arms up to 15,000 whereas the Soviet Union will have to break its strategic nuclear forces and build them anew according to the U.S. pattern.

The stands of the sides still remain fundamentally different. The main flaw of the U.S. counter-proposals is still the same: they bypass the key, fundamental matter, namely, the question of a ban on the creation of space strike weapons. Without a ban on them it is unrealistic to hope for effecting any cutbacks in strategic arms.

Such cutbacks would be both senseless and dangerous under the conditions when the USA tries to get a decisive military superiority over the USSR via outer space and to obtain a capability to deliver a first nuclear strike with impunity.

The USA states that the Soviet proposal on banning space strikes weapons is ostensibly a precondition, that the SDI should not be discussed at the talks and that the USA will create space strike weapons under any circumstances. All those discourses run counter to the January understanding jointly with the formulated task: to prevent an arms race in outer space.

By delaying a solution to the question of outer space, the United States hinders accords on limiting nuclear arms, scientists and experts stated. In outer space, there are no space strike weapons now and they should not be there. The USSR will never be the first to make a stride into outer space with weapons, and it calls on the United States to follow suit. One would like to hope that the United States will realize the reasonability of the Soviet stand.

Different Approaches Noted

LD180613 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0500 GMT 18 Nov 85

[Commentator Vladimir Fadeyev report on 17 November Geneva press conference with analysis by international affairs journalist Nikolay Shishlin]

[Text] Commentator Vladimir Fadeyev will now bring you some reports from abroad from radio and news agency correspondents:

The forthcoming Soviet-U.S. meeting in Geneva is the main thing that excites broad circles of the public in different countries today. Geneva has also prepared for this important historic event; several thousands of journalists from all corners of the globe have already gathered there in order to report the meeting between the leaders of the two countries. As our correspondents report, a press conference has taken place in Geneva in which Soviet representatives have taken part. It was devoted to the key question which is due to be discussed at the forthcoming meeting; and this, as is known, is the question of ending the arms race in all spheres in all directions, and of taking measures aimed at removing the nuclear threat: that is to say, the thing that makes up the essence of the Soviet peace initiatives.

During the press conference the U.S. side circulated its own counterproposals. I shall ask Nikolay Shishlin, a journalist writing on international affairs, to describe what they amount to:

[Begin Shishlin recording] What is characteristic of the U.S. counterproposals? First, the United States still considers it necessary to adhere to its so-called Strategic Defense Initiative and is moving in the direction of opening the door for an arms race in space. As far as strategic armaments are concerned, the United States, while apparently talking of its willingness to make considerable reductions in its strategic offensive armaments, is once again repeating the flaws that were characteristic of its former position; that is, it is insisting that the structure of a number of Soviet strategic armaments be broken and is proposing that the Soviet strategic offensive system be restructured in the U.S. way. As is known, the main U.S. means are based on submarines and on the bomber fleet; that is, it should be restructured in such a way as to give the United States a certain advantage and to make the Soviet Union carry an additional burden of expenditure with the restructuring of its defense system.

On the medium-range missiles — the medium-range means capable of carrying nuclear weapons — the U.S. proposals appear to be clearly unbalanced. In itself, the fact that this is

being declared openly is, of course, a step which in some ways can be expected to deaden the deep impression which is being produced here by the proposals of the Soviet Union, which is really interested in ending the arms race on earth and preventing an arms race in space. [end recording]

Opposition to SDI Program Outlined by Officials

Zamyatin Remarks

LD151950 Belgrade TANJUG in English 1847 GMT 15 Nov 85

[Text] Geneva, Nov 15 (TANJUG) — Leonid Zamyatin, who will be the Soviet Union's chief spokesman during the upcoming Reagan-Gorbachev meeting, today categorically denied Western press reports that Moscow has softened its strong opposition to the U.S. program for a space-based anti-missile system.

At a news conference here today, Zamyatin stated that the Soviet Union cannot accept anything in the program since agreement to any of its points would mean coming to terms with opening up the way for the militarization of space.

Zamyatin confirmed yesterday's statement by President Reagan that, during the preparations for the summit, the two sides came closer to reaching an agreement on renewing and expanding bilateral cultural exchange programs. But he declined to say whether the agreement would be signed during the meeting.

Asked if reports that diplomatic relations between the Soviet Union and Israel may be restored were founded, Zamyatin said they were ordinary speculation. Even examining such a possibility is out of the question so long as Israel continues its aggressive policy towards its Arab neighbours, he said.

Sagdeyev Urges Renunciation

LD152108 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 15 Nov 85

[Special correspondent Boris Kalyagin video report from Geneva on preparations for the Reagan-Gorbachev summit, including an interview with Roald Zinnurovich Sagdeyev, director of the Institute of Space Research of the USSR Academy of Sciences — from the "Vremya" newscast — recorded]

[Text] Geneva is preparing for the arrival of the high ranking guests. The ancient lakeside city has witnessed many international forums, but perhaps none has evoked such enormous interest as the forthcoming Soviet-U.S. summit meeting.

The signs of the summit meeting are already visible everywhere on the streets of Geneva. Even the shopkeepers are hurrying to take advantage of the significance of this event. The local authorities are striving to ensure favorable conditions both for the holding of the meeting and for coverage of it by the world press. An international press center has opened in the center of the city. In it, almost 3,000 journalists are receiving their accreditation, a number unprecedented for Geneva. This too is a reflection of the close attention being devoted to the summit by the world community.

Problems of the demilitarization of space and of limitation of nuclear arms were the focus of attention of a meeting of three Soviet scientists, Academicians Velikhov, Arbatov, and Sagdeyev with the press.

The public is worried by the question of how ready both sides are to achieve a mutually acceptable accord.

In the press center I met with Academician Sagdeyev, director of the Institute of Space Research of the USSR Academy of Sciences.

Roald Zinnurovich, just before the Geneva meeting U.S. Administration spokesmen are declaring that the United States has no intention of renouncing President Reagan's so-called Strategic Defense Initiative, which has been dubbed the "star wars" program. For our part we stress that if there is no ban on the militarization of space, neither will there be any possibility of achieving agreement on limiting nuclear arms. I would like to ask you, as one of the major specialists in the area of space research, why we regard the problem of the nonmilitarization of space as the crucial and decisive one for the success of the Soviet-U.S. negotiations?

[Sagdeyev] It seems to me that the position of some U.S. Administration spokesmen is characterized by an inability or perhaps deliberate reluctance to look 10 or 15 years into the future and view more closely the picture sketched fully realistically, in somber colors, in the recent speech by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev to representatives of the congress of Nobel laureates. Indeed, a world filled with a vast number of weapons of destruction, not only land-based, sea-based, and submarine-based weapons, but also thousands of missiles and every possible type of exotic weapon in space, will present a dreadful picture of uncertainty and extreme instability, in which the risk of even the accidental outbreak of war will be unacceptably high. It is precisely an understanding of this stern truth — incidentally, this viewpoint is shared by an overwhelming cross-section of the international scientific public. [as heard] I must say that our scientific colleagues in the United States, major scientists who in their time have done much in the defense field and the military field, understand perfectly the danger of extending the arms race in to space.

Now, the moment of truth has really arrived, when it is necessary to reach precise agreement on the point that the interconnection, the indissoluble interconnection between offensive arms on earth and in space must be broken by a renunciation of the transfer of arms into space.

[Kalyagin] There is very little time left before the summit meeting starts. Today it is difficult to predict whether the day of the oepning will be sunny or overcast. In Geneva the weather constantly changes: one moment the sun is out, the next it is raining or even snowing. But one would like the political barometer to read "fair."

Given good will on both sides, the meeting could become the

beginning of fruitful Soviet-U.S. dialogue. This is what hundreds of millions of inhabitants of the planet are waiting for and hoping for.

Gen Maksimov Views Stances

LD180736 Moscow TASS in English 0730 GMT 18 Nov 85

[Text] Moscow November 18 TASS — The USSR is not the initiator of the arms race on earth. The Soviet Union unilaterally renounced the first use of nuclear weapons, introduced a moratorium on all nuclear explosions and halted the deployment of medium-range missiles in Europe. The USSR has told the whole world that it will not be the first to introduce weapons in outer space, General of the Army Yuriy Maksimov, commander-in-chief of the Strategic Missile Forces and deputy minister of defense of the USSR, says in a PRAVDA interview on the eve of day of the Missile Forces and Artillery, observed in the Soviet Union November 19.

He points out that in response to the Soviet peace proposals, the aggressive forces are making ever new nuclear explosions and testing antisatellite weapons.

The paramount objective of the policy pursued by the imperialist powers is to achieve military superiority over socialism, Yuriy Maksimov says. They are trying hard to start another round of the arms race and taking practical steps to militarize space so as to prepare for "star wars." What all this amounts to is the development of qualitatively new systems which would enable the aggressor to deliver the first disarming strike at the USSR and its allies and to win a nuclear-missile war.

But the USSR is sufficiently strong to give a crushing rebuff to any attempt to encroach on the security and peaceful work of the Soviet people, the deputy defense minister says.

'Political Realities' of SDI

PM151623 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 16 Nov 85 Morning Edition p 5

[Doctor of Historical Sciences A. Arbatov article: "'Star Wars' and Political Realities"]

[Text] Can one seriously count on constructive results at the Geneva summit meeting and in general on success in the Soviet-U.S. dialogue on nuclear and space arms? It is necessary to have dealings with none other than representatives of the very administration which from year to year makes the greatest possible efforts, extracting billions of dollars from Congress for military space and nuclear programs.? So it is not surprising that even many sincere supporters of agreements between the USSR and the United States have recently increasingly frequently put forward pessimistic views on the prospects for Soviet-U.S. accords.

All the same, without minimizing the difficulties in the path of new agreements, it would be incorrect to believe that the prevention of the militarization of space is a hopeless cause.

A whole series of consideration favor this position. And the fact that the history of Soviet-U.S. relations did not begin with the present U.S. Administration and will not end with it is not the most important of those considerations. The next administration's course will be determined to a decisive degree by the military-strategic situation in the world and the political situation outside and inside the United States at the end of the eighties.

The determining factor in the military and political situation in the international arena was and will continue to be the correlation of forces which has emerged in the world and the economic, scientific, and technical might of socialism, on which the Soviet policy of maintaining the global military-strategic equilibrium rests.

The Soviet Union will not permit superiority over itself.

If necessary, countermeasures on the part of the USSR could take place in the sphere of not only offensive, but also defensive weapons systems, including space-based systems. As a recently published extensive study by the U.S. Congress' Office of Technology Assessment admits, in the conditions of the unlimited race for offensive and defensive arms, the prospects for achieving and keeping U.S. superiority are at best "very dim."

At the same time the launching of a new round in the arms race on earth and in space would be too high a price to pay for convincing the militarists once again of the unattainability of military superiority. In view of the dangerous consequences of this wasteful "trial of strength" in the decades to come, it would be better to display farsightedness and good will now, and by joint efforts to prevent the next spiral in the nuclear and space arms race.

In this connection we must not underestimate the fact that, for all the might of the military-industrial complex and the influence of its placemen in the present U.S. Administration, the course of U.S. policy at the talks does not only depend on those circles which are unconditionally committed to new armaments. Among the broad public, in the Congress, and in political circles in the United States and other capitalist countries, there are considerable forces which oppose the "star wars" programs.

On the other hand, the coalition in support of the "Strategic Defense Initiative" is far from monolithic. Given a certain turn of events, it could collapse and lose influence. And the "initiative" itself will continue to be the subject of an acute struggle in political and scientific circles in the United States and the allied states.

For the time being, the supporters of the "star wars" projects are managing to mislead many people with detailed arguments about physical and technical aspects of space lasers and charged particle accelerators, electromagnetic guns, supersensors, supercomputers, and so forth. All this sounds mysterious and impressive to nonspecialists and leads their thoughts away from policy and strategy and into exotic technical matters.

But as time passes, even in Western public circles there will inevitably be a growing awareness of what the majority of

specialists (both supporters and opponents of the "initiative") can already see clearly. Complete invulnerability to nuclear weapons is an impossible fantasy. To be specific: However much money is poured into ABM systems and however many echelons of these systems are heaped up on earth and in space, they will not be able to protect the population and industry in the event of nuclear war; that is to say, they will not be capable of ensuring the attainment of the main goal which is now being used to justify the collossal expenditure associated with the "initiative." Many of the people who are currently being misled by the administration's demagoguery will undoubtedly change their attitude toward the SDI when they realize that the promised "technical miracles" cannot eliminate the threat of catastrophic losses in a nuclear war, but instead will make the strategic situation extremely unstable and unpredictable and the arms race completely uncontrollable.

The future of the 1972 Treaty on the Limitation of ABM Systems is another very important factor in assessing the prospects of the "defense initiative." It is the chief contractual-legal obstacle to the development [razvitiye] of space strike means. In particular, Article V unequivocally prohibits the creation [sozdavat], testing, or deployment of space-based ABM systems or components. The treaty enjoys considerable political support among the public, in the U.S. Congress, and throughout the world. And this does not let the SDI supporters openly discard it.

In order to weaken the popularity of this treaty, an increasingly intensive campaign is being mounted in the West to discredit it. Unsubstantiated accusations against the Soviet Union of imaginary "violations" of particular articles in it are being invented.

The Soviet Union strictly observes all the terms of that treaty, as well as of other agreements which it has signed. The purpose of the fabrications about "violations" is perfectly obvious — to divert public attention and make the public close is eyes to the U.S. measures within the framework of the "defense initiative." These conflict not only in the long term but right now with the provisions of the treaty.

The administration and the Pentagon are practicing the arbitrary interpretation of concepts such as "creation" [sozdaniye], "ABM component," and "tests for ABM purposes." In this way they are trying to demonstrate that the so-called "research" being conducted in the United States, as well as the "demonstrations" of elements and prototypes of space strike means planned for the late eighties and the early nineties, are supposedly permitted by the ABM Limitation Treaty.

True, even the most zealous advocates of SDI cannot fail to admit that the deployment of ABM space systems is unequivocally prohibited by the treaty. However, adherents of space strike arms reckon that in the next few years their programs will manage to acquire insuperable inertia by virtue of the funds spent by interested organizations and the obligations of political leaders. They also hope that by means of their measures and the campaign about imaginary Soviet "violations," they will succeed in shaking the significance and popularity of the treaty and will get away with its final abandonment without substantial costs.

The continuous buildup and improvement of nuclear arsenals and the seeming inability of the talks to radically stop this process are being actively utilized by SDI supporters to make their plans attractive in the eyes of the broad public. Their plans are passed off as a military-technical "alternative" to the policy of a conscientious search for mutually aceptable agreements.

In fact, however, the appeals by SDI supporters are a recipe for an uncontrolled arms race leading the world to catastrophe. The real alternative to this very dangerous path is contained in the Soviet Union's new peace initiatives. It must be obvious to everyone who understands the essence of the problem, and who judges without prejudice, that the radical reduction and limitation of nuclear arms, if this proves possible in the immediate future, followed by their total liquidation, is preferable to the prospects of the creation [sozdaniye] of antimissile and other space strike means — prospects full of dangers for decades to come.

Soviet, U.S. Space Weapons Stances Contrasted

PM171613 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 16 Nov 85
First Edition p 4

[Article by A. Kondratyev: "Explicit and Clear Proposals; Nonmilitarization of Space and Reduction of Strategic Nuclear Potentials"]

[Text] The Soviet Union has submitted for the Soviet-U.S. talks in Geneva specific proposals on the entire package of problems relating to space and nuclear (strategic and medium-range) armaments. These proposals include a total ban on strike space means, a radical 50-percent reduction in the nuclear armaments of the USSR and the United States capable of reaching each other's territory, and the establishment for the delivery vehicles remaining after the reduction of an equal ceiling for both sides' nuclear charges — 6,000 units for each side.

The Soviet Union has demonstrated in practice to the whole world its desire and readiness to proceed along the path of elaborating effective accords aimed at preventing the arms race in space and halting it on earth, limiting and reducing nuclear armaments, and consolidating strategic stability, as envisaged by the 8 January 1985 joint Soviet-U.S. statement on the subject matter and aims of the talks on nuclear and space armaments. The proposals submitted by the USSR are comprehensive in terms of the problems they encompass, are interconnected in essence, are radical in their approach toward the solution of the questions under discussion, and are fair from the viewpoint of the principle of parity and identical security. The Soviet Union is displaying flexibility in the choice of ways of achieving the talks' goals. It has expressed the readiness to seek points of contact between the positions of the USSR and the United States.

The Soviet stance on key questions affecting the basis of the strategic balance of forces and strategic stability should be clear to everyone. One such key issue is the question of the relationship between strategic offensive forces and strike space armaments, which Washington shamefacedly calls "defensive" means. This question was examined by both sides during the SALT I negotiations, and its agreed solution was enshrined in 1972 in the ABM Limitation Treaty between the USSR and the United States. The

treaty's fundamental articles ban the deployment of ABM defense systems for the country's territory and the creation of the basis for such defense. The creation [sozdaniye], testing, and deployment of space-based ABM systems are also banned. By signing this document of unlimited duration, the USSR and the United States acknowledged that the most important conditions for ensuring strategic stability are the sides' voluntary renunciation of the possession of broad-scale ABM systems and the maintenance of approximate parity in strategic offensive armaments. These parameters for the sides' strategic relationship have created preconditions for the limitation and consistent mutual reduction of strategic offensive armaments with a view to reducing the level of nuclear confrontation. And it is not the Soviet Union's fault that the positive process of curbing the arms race initiated in the sixties has not been seen through to the end. As is well known, the thwarting by the United States of the ratification of the SALT II treaty, which was the result of the course toward torpedoing it, was an obstacle to this. However, the historical experience of the two countries' collaboration in the arms control field convincingly shows that to make headway in the direction of enhancing strategic stability and limiting and reducing strategic nuclear armaments it is essential to rule out factors which introduce an imbalance to strategic equalization and primarily the most destabilizing factor — the possession of large-scale ABM systems. That was true in 1972 and it remains true to this day. What is the essence of this premise?

It is well known that approximate parity in armaments and identical security are a key element of strategic stability. With the deployment of ABM weapons, a fundamental change to the existing strategic balance of forces would begin. There is no need to prove that the unilateral or faster [operezhayushcheye] creation [sozdaniye] of an ABM system secures for the country which has developed this system the opportunity to deliver a first strike against an adversary and to repel a retaliatory strike or limit the harm caused by it. It is clear that under these conditions the other side would be obliged to take the necessary steps in the interests of safeguarding its own security. A new spiral of the arms race would inevitably begin. Military-strategic equilibrium would undoubtedly be restored but at a higher level of armed confrontation. And under those conditions there could be no question of any limitation or reduction of nuclear arsenals or consolidation of strategic stability. Such is the reality. What do the apologists of the "star wars" program and the supporters of the creation of strike space armaments have to say on this subject?

The main "theoretical" thesis of the defenders of wide-scale ABM systems in the United States is that with the sides' parallel creation [sozdaniye] and deployment of these systems the problem of the arms race allegedly does not arise because both sides will possess ABM systems. Moreover, the deployment of ABM systems will allegedly devalue strategic nuclear missile armaments and ultimately sweep them onto the trash heap of history. Therefore, it is claimed, a wide-scale ABM system and, equally, the U.S. SDI program, which is geared toward creating [sozdaniye] such a system, help to strengthen strategic stability and consequently to consolidate peace. The falsity of this "peace-loving" concept becomes obvious if you consider that with the sides' parallel creation [sozdaniye] and deployment of wide-scale ABM systems, a race is inevitable in the sphere of the quantitative buildup and qualitative improvement of ABM facilities by virtue of the practical impossibility of reliably assessing and comparing the effectiveness of the sides' ABM systems. That is why each side will seek to enhance its strategic potential by every means with the aid of defensive and offensive means. It is clear that the creation [sozdaniye] and deployment of wide-scale ABM systems, despite the claims of the defenders of SDI, does not and cannot create a basis strengthening strategic stability or further limiting and reducing strategic offensive nuclear armaments.

Does Washington understand this? It cannot fail to. What, then, is it gambling on? There can be only one answer: on an accelerated breaking away from the Soviet Union through new technologies, on their maximum utilization for creating [sozdaniye] wide-scale ABM systems with space-based elements, and on the attainment of military superiority on the basis of the faster [operezhayushchiye] creation [sozdaniye] of a first-strike potential. That is why the United States categorically rejects the ban on the creation [sozdaniye] and deployment of space strike armaments, and states that it will not stop work on the SDI program. Moreover, it is endeavoring to "involve" in this program the intellectual and material resources of as many countries of the capitalist world as possible, promising them a place under the "ABM umbrella" in return. It is not hard to see behind all this the U.S. desire to assimilate the sphere of armaments hard to control in the qualitative respect that ABM systems built on new physical principles represent in order to build up the effectiveness of ABM means and create opportunities for delivering a first strike.

This U.S. line is closely linked with the its approach toward nuclear arms limitation. The United States has chosen ground-based ICBM's which comprise the basis of the USSR's combat might as the most desirable subject for limitations in Soviet strategic armaments. These ICBM's have been declared by Washington to be the "most dangerous" and "destabilizing" armaments. Considering the real fact that the Soviet Union, apart from its strategic nuclear forces, has no other nuclear means reaching U.S. territory, it is not hard to understand the aim of this choice: to limit to the maximum the Soviet Union's ability to respond to a strike against its territory. At the same time the United States is seeking to preserve the offensive potential of its medium-range missiles in West Europe and forward-based means deployed around the Soviet Union. As is well known, this potential is of a strategic nature with respect to our country.

The USSR understands where all this is leading. The United States' long-term orientation toward the creation and deployment of a wide-scale ABM system, presented verbally as a strategy for eliminating nuclear weapons on earth, is in fact a strategy for acquiring military superiority, speculating on people's fear of nuclear war and donning peaceful clothing. Such is the truth.

The U.S. course toward acquiring military superiority is hopeless because the USSR cannot and will not allow a disruption of military-strategic parity. The Soviet Union will give an adequate response to the challenge which is being prepared to it. There will be no U.S. monopoly in space. But in that case it will be a matter of a new round of the arms race.

But what about the automatic disappearance of nuclear missile armaments from the face of the earth which the SDI's supporters promise the world public after the creation [sozdaniye] and deployment of wide-scale ABM systems? This is also part of the Pentagon's "strategic" lie. It is not in order to eliminate nuclear missile weapons on earth or to strengthen strategic stability that the United States is spending billions of dollars, expending enormous intellectual resources, and preparing "star wars." No; the U.S. "Strategic Defense Initiative" is not bringing the world's peoples nuclear disarmament. "Star wars" are still wars and they are prepared by the United States to achieve its imperial claims on earth.

The Soviet Union consistently advocates closing the way into space for weapons and preventing the dissemination of the arms race into outer space. The USSR's proposals are clear and substantiated: in order to minimize the potential for disrupting the strategic balance of forces and to create a firm basis for the consistent reduction of nuclear arms levels, it is essential to impose a total ban on space strike weapons. Without that, deep reductions of nuclear armaments are impossible. The Soviet Union has no intention of helping the United States to acquire a first-strike potential.

Space Weapons Ban Will Solve 'Dilemma'

LD161205 Moscow TASS in English 1144 GMT 16 Nov 85

["Expectations and Hopes" — TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow November 16 TASS — "A lot of people throughout the world realize today the incompatiability of creating strike space arms and drastically reducing the existing nuclear armaments", *PRAVDA*'s special correspondents write from Geneva today. "Apparently, people will have to solve this dilemma sooner or later. Objectively, it cannot be evaded. The Soviet proposals providing for a ban on outer space militarization is the way out of the impasse. Moreover, our programme for turning outer space into an arena of fruitful international cooperation opens up broad vistas."

"People of good will across the world wish that a way out of the obtained situation be found, that bold and constructive steps be taken towards terminating the arms race and preventing space militarization, in other words, towards a more calm and safer world. These are exactly the expectations which are set for the Geneva meeting."

Reporting about thousands of letters coming in these days to the Soviet mission from various countries, the correspondents underline: "Peoples' warm messages contain wishes of success to the Geneva summit, the expression of support for the vigorous and constructive peace policy of the Soviet Union. There are a lot of postcards expressing gratitude for the announced moratorium on any nuclear explosions".

The dispatch points out that the Soviet Union is going to the Geneva meeting with the comprehensive programme of peace initiatives which can put up a truly insurmaountable barrier in the way of outer space militarization and halve the nuclear systems of the USSR and the United States reaching each other's territory. These and other proposals of the USSR open up a real opportunity to improve appreciably the situation in the world, scale down the threat of a nuclear conflict and pave the way for nuclear disarmament. This is exactly what peoples expect from Geneva."

Links Between SDI, Europe's Eureka Noted

LD180006 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1500 GMT 17 Nov 85

[From the "International Panorama" program, presented by Aleksandr Bovin — live]

[Text] The U.S. rough hustling tactics can be felt not only in Canada, but also in Western Europe. Washington is trying to get support for its "star wars" program from its West European allies. Things are obviously not in order on the NATO European flank; however, Paris' opposition is the most radical. Speaking in the Institute of Higher National Defense Studies, the French prime minister, Laurent Fabius, recently declared the following — I quote: The U.S. program was originally presented as a defense program. In fact, however, it finds its expression in the development [razrabotka] of new armaments and their siting [razmeshcheniy] in space. If such a system is set up [dozdana], the prime minister said, this will bring in its train the deployment [razvertyvaniye] of other similar systems, too, and it thus serves to spur on the creation [sozdaniye] of new offensive weapons. It will engender a new spiral in the competition between the shield and the sword. This U.S. initiative, given the uncertainty connected with it, could become a destabilizng factor in the general strategic situation. In these conditions, Fabius concluded, France does not consider it possible to join in the U.S. initiative. This is the thinking in Paris.

Of the European members of NATO, Denmark, Norway, Greece, and the Netherlands have, like France, officially refused to participate in the "star wars" program. The first to allow itself to be persuaded at the intergovernmental level was Great Britain. Michael Heseltine, the British defense secretary, quite recently in Brussels agreed with his U.S. colleague the conditions for participation by British firms and scientific institutes in realizing the "star wars" program. True, in order to come to an agreement, London lifted its main demand: that its businessmen and scientists be guaranteed orders worth $1.5 billion. The United States refused to give such a guarantee, but London went along with the agreement. This accord, it is true, requires ratification by the British Government. Ratification will evidently soon ensue.

Stormy discussions are under way in the FRG. Foreign Minister Genscher reportedly is adopting — or more accurately, had adopted — a more cautious position than Chancellor Kohl. But it seems that Genscher has given way, and they have apparently agreed now to wait for the meting between Reagan and Gorbachev in Geneva; and after this has ended, Manfred Woerner, the FRG defense minister, will inform his U.S. colleague that the FRG officially backs up research work within the framework of this Strategic Defense Initiative. The press reports,

however, that, strictly speaking, this will not be an intergovernmental agreement. It will simply be an exchange of messages in which the basic conditions for participation by FRG firms and West German scientists in the defense initiative will be laid down. Well, there is as yet no final decision.

Here, comrades, one must bear in mind a juridical nuance: It is not governments which are taking part in the realization in the Strategic Defense Initiative — Britain or the FRG, for instance, or Italy, shall we say, which is also discussing this. The governments are only coming to agreement with Washington on designating some general legal framework within which private firms and scientific institutions will participate in work on the "star wars" program. It is precisely here that the two-faced, so to speak, contradictory attitude of Western Europe to the Strategic Defense Initiative is reflected. Altogether, the disputes and vacillation and doubts over "star wars" are continuing in Europe.

Attempts to consolidate the scientific and technical efforts of Western Europe are also continuing within the framework of the French-proposed Eureka project. Two intergovernmental conferences have already been held on this project, in Paris and Hanover, which dealt with starting up Eureka. The first joint projects have already been designated. In its conception and realization, Eureka is intendedto lead to the establishment of a so-called European technological community, that is, to strengthen Western Europe's efforts in the competitive struggle with the United States, first and foremost, and with Japan.

Participation in Eureka is regarded not as an alternative to participation in the "star wars" program. Many firms are trying to invest money on both sides of the ocean. Furthermore, Western Europe is stressing the civilian nature of Eureka, although it is not denied that certain projects and research can also have military applicaitons. What is more, this military note has started to resound rather more clearly, and the U.S. ear, of course, is heeding this note very well. And the United States is trying to reinforce it, too, by more or less delicately giving the Europeans to understand that the space shield which it is planned to erect in the United States will be unlikely to give a complete and reliable cover to Western Europe — although the Pentagon will strive to make it do so. It would nevertheless be useful, the West Europeans are being persuaded, if the allies started to develop [razrabatyvat] their own scheme, oriented to the specific characteristics of Western Europe; if, so to speak, they augmented the U.S. initiative with their own European initiative. This fact reflects Washington's general concept: the way to demilitarization on earth passes by way of militarization of space; and in a more generla form, the way to disarmament in general passes by way of up-arming. It is, incidentally, with just this baggage that they have come to Geneva, unfortunately.

W. Europe Sees Talks of 'Paramount' Importance

LD161833 Moscow TASS in English 1811 GMT 16 Nov 85

[Text] Geneva, November 16 TASS — (TASS special correspondents). The upcoming Soviet-U.S. summit meeting in Geneva is seen in Western Europe and all over the world as an event of paramount political significance. Both the political circles and broad public pin great hopes on it.

At the same time, concern is mounting in Western Europe about the aggravation of international tensions and growth of the burden of the arms race. The pressure of the forces in the United States, which believe that the unbridled arms race being carried out by the Washington administration, will undermine the economy of that country. This manifests itself also in toughter opposition of the U.S. Congress on issues of budgetary appropriations.

This has been explicitly expressed, in particular, by Les Aspin, chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, who said that a choice should be made without delay between a build-up of miiitary power and elimination of the budgetary deficit. One cannot have both. It's either a build-up of power or a reduction of the deficit, he stressed.

A clash between the interests of the military-industrial complex and the broadly interpreted national interests of the USA, the Reagan administration's open favouritism for the military-industrial complex and at the same time its reluctance to compromise itself ultimately in the eyes of public opinion, on the one hand, are the causes behind its unprincipled manoeuvring and, on the other hand, apparently create an atmosphere of nervousness on the eve of the Geneva meeting.

An atmosphere of a lack of confidence and confusion on the U.S. side, has, in the opinion of observers, strongly increased after the firm statement made by Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the Central Committee of the CPSU, at a meeting with a delegation of the Congress of Nobel Prize laureates. A particularly great impression was struck by his warning that the deployment of weapons in outer space may result only in a further build-up of the arms race and such a heightening of tensions, that will be even more difficult to control.

There is growing conviction in Western Europe that the continuation of Reagan's "star wars" programme will inevitably whip up the race of offensive weapons, not only of the two great powers, but also of other countries, above all, in Europe.

Attention is drawn in that connection to the latest statement by French Defence Minister Paul Quiles at the Higher National Defence Institute, who said that France will respond the deployment of defence systems in outer space with a build-up of its offensive nuclear potential. [as received]

The allies of the United States are displeased with the U.S. President giving "confusing signals" on the eve of the summit meeting, which is so important for European security and the destiny of the world. Attention is drawn here to the fact that during a meeting with Soviet journalists in the White House he made a statement for everybody to hear that the United States was prepared, first, to share selflessly the results of its research on the "Strategic Defence Initiative" with other countries, including with the Soviet Union, and, second that in any case, the USA would start the deployment of anti-ballistic missile systems in outer space only after offensive strategic weapons were scrapped.

The West European allies of the USA were discouraged and exasperated by the fact that literally the next day the White House actually disavowed the President by saying that he had

made an "inaccurate statement". President Reagan's statement in an interview with a group of radio correspondents of the West European countries confused them even more. The President said that the United States would make anti-missile weapons available to all, when they were created, but not free of charge. I do not mean, the President said, that we will make it available free of charge. They will have to pay for it, but at its prime cost. All this is a source of suspicion in Western Europe that the U.S. military-industrial complex with the Pentagon at its head, "keeps Reagan in the pocket" as regards the militarization of outer space and a further build-up of the U.S. armament programme.

Therefore the prevailing opinion among the hundreds of correspondents, who came to Geneva to cover the Soviet-U.S. meeting is that the U.S. side will block a constructive solution of the questions of strengthening security and reducing arms.

The U.S. side is trying to make up for the vulnerability of its stand of refusal to go its part of way in search for a solution of the problems of the limitation and ending of the weapons race, which are of concern for international public, by an intensification of activity of anti-Soviet forces of every kind. It has been announced that a special emissary is to come to Geneva from Washington for a series of statements to the public and journalists in defence of the "star wars" programme. U.S. Ambassador to Switzerland F.R. Whitlessey gave an interview to newspapers in a strongly anti-Soviet slanderous spirit, making charges against the Soviet Union of alleged "violations" of treaties.

Yet despite all of such "measures", which by no means contribute to the success of the meeting, it is clear that broad public has been impressed by the Soviet peace offensive. It is stressed here that the main fact is that the Soviet Union has approached in all seriousness the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting, made a number of unilateral steps designed to create a favourable atmosphere for its success, put forward a whole complex of constructive and realistic initiatives aimed at putting an end to the weapons race.

[signed] Gennadiy Shishkin
Yevgeniy Ivanov
Yuriy Lopatin
Yevgeniy Korzhev
Vladislav Shishlov

Draft UN Resolution Vote Shows U.S.' Hypocrisy'

LD151018 Moscow TASS in English 0921 GMT 15 Nov 85

[Text] New York, November 15 TASS — The international community of nations has expressed hope that the upcoming meeting of the leaders of the USSR and the United States in Geneva will give a decisive impulse to the talks between the two countries for them to lead to reaching effective accords as soon as possible on ending the nuclear arms race, on reducing nuclear arsenals, on preventing an arms race in outer space and on using outer space for peaceful purposes. This hope is expressed in a resolution which has been passed by the First Committee of the U.N. General Assembly on a proposal made by a large group of states.

The resolution has it that the vital interests of all peoples are staked at the current Soviet-U.S. talks which are being conducted with a view to working out effective accords aimed at preventing an arms race in outer space and at ending it on earth. The First Committee points out that the talks should ultimately lead to full elimination of nuclear weapons everywhere.

The Soviet Union actively comes out in favour of reaching concrete tangible agreements at the Geneva summit meeting. Such agreements would promote stronger security in the world and would open up an opportunity to stop the intensifying process of the stockpiling and sophistication of weapons, stated Viktor Israelyan, representative of the USSR. The Soviet leadership attaches much importance to the forthcoming summit meeting and does everything for it to yield tangible results.

In Geneva the Soviet side will strive for a just and constructive solution to the most urgent problems of our time. The USSR, aware of responsibility for the destiny of peace, has come forward with a set of new initiatives on practically all matters of disarmament and termination of the arms race including, of course, matters which are the agreed-upon subject of consideration and solution in their interrelationship at the current talks between the USSR and the USA on nuclear and space arms.

The draft resolution was supported by an overwhelming majority of delegations — 117. The USA and its NATO partners as well as Japan and Israel abstained, vividly showing both the hypocrisy of their declarations as to a "serious approach" to the Geneva summit meeting and disregard for the hopes and aspirations of the international community.

U.S. Brings 'Empty' Diplomatic Portfolio

LD170249 Moscow in English to North America 2300 GMT 16 Nov 85

["Moscow Viewpoint," by Valentin Zorin]

[Text] I made notes for this talk at the Geneva press center where hundreds of newsmen have arrived in advance of the Soviet-U.S. summit. Naturally everybody at the press center is now talking of what the summit will bring and speculation is rife. In my view, nothing is more futile and unrewarding than to engage in political speculation. There are, however, solid facts that deserve being mentioned on the eve of the summit.

I have the impression that as if conducted by an invisible, but quite real baton, the orchestra of the U.S. media has begun to play a tune sounding very sad, if not funeral. The media are trying to impress on the public the idea that hardly anything can be expected of the Geneva summit. It's implied that if the leaders of the two countries don't quarrel or better still, agree on another meeting, the Geneva summit would be a success. This looks like an attempt to prepare the U.S. public for a summit that will bring few or no results. Some people in Washington would apparently like to see [words indistinct] even the slightest progress towards a better international situation.

To prevent such a development from causing too much disappointment the public are led to assume a pessimistic frame of mind. Most of the people I talked to at the Geneva press center

don't deny that the Soviet Union has advanced a series of meaningful and constructive initiatives in the runup to the summit. The Soviet Union halted all nuclear weapons tests, imposed a moratorium on the deployment of medium-range missiles in Europe and tabled far-reaching proposals on radical changes in strategic weapons capable of reaching the territories of the two sides.

What has the U.S. side to say on its part, I asked those I talked to? U.S. analysts failed to give a straight answer to that very straightforward question. They couldn't answer it for the simple reason that, as most political observers point out, Washington's diplomatic portfolio is practically empty on the eve of the summit. It looks as though the United States Administration simply haven't realized that it's necessary to abandon the old and hackneyed stereotypes to prevent a catastrophe. The forthcoming Soviet-U.S. summit is important above all because it will take place at a critical moment. Decisions that may be adopted by the summit can mark a turning point in history.

To engage in scoring propaganda points in the circumstances, or still worse try and turn a meaningful discussion into empty talk or a meaningless debate, would amount to missing a great and very rare opportunity.

PRAVDA Discusses Geneva Summit Prospects

PM161850 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 17 Nov 85
First Edition p 4

[Nikolay Kurdyumov "International Review"]

[Text] Responsible Approach

It can be said without exaggeration that the world is living in expectation of the Soviet-U.S. meeting in Geneva. Broad circles of the public in various countries are now following the preparations for it with exceptional attention and hope; and the upcoming talks on 19-20 November between M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and U.S. President R. Reagan, their importance, and their prospects, are the dominant theme in the world press. The following illustration is typical, in particular: A colossal "force" of journalists and observers — several thousand representatives of news agencies, newspapers, television, and radio from all parts of the world — has descended, so to speak, to cover the meeting between the two countries' leaders in Switzerland.

The tremendous attention being paid to the upcoming meeting and to Soviet-U.S. relations is understandable and natural. It is hard to overestimate the role and significance of Soviet-U.S. relations in the modern world. It is quite obvious that the international situation depends largely on the policy of the USSR and the United States and on the condition and development of relations between the two major countries in the world. Thus, as past experience shows, an improvement in relations has a favorable impact on the general world climate, while a deterioration in them leads inevitably to an increase in tension. Something else is also certain: the tremendous degree of responsibility borne by the two powers' leaders for the fate of peace on earth in our worrying, difficult time. Mankind has now reached a point where special wisdom in decisions, thoughtfulness [vzveshennost] and restraint in actions, and the consideration not only of national interests but also of the interests of the whole world community are required.

The Soviet Union is convinced that there can be no goals that would justify unleashing nuclear war. The Soviet and U.S. peoples, like all mankind, have a common enemy — the looming threat of nuclear war, and its danger is increasing as the arms race intensifies. Awareness of this danger and of our responsibility for the future of life on earth itself, the vital interests of the Soviet and U.S. peoples, and, finally, the dictates of reason urgently demand not confrontation but joint efforts aimed at eliminating the nuclear threat, curbing the arms race, resolutely improving Soviet-U.S. relations, and strengthening mutual trust.

It is precisely this that the Soviet Union is insistently calling for. "We in the USSR," M.S. Gorbachev declared in the course of the meeting in Moscow with a delegation of the Congress of Nobel Prize Winners, "believe that there is today no more urgent and important task than to block channels for the further stockpiling of nuclear weapons — and nuclear weapons of increasingly sophisticated types — and at the same time to tightly close the door to the taking of weapons into space."

The Soviet Union's principled line vis-a-vis the United States and its unvarying and consistent course of peaceful coexistence were precisely and clearly reaffirmed in the draft of the new edition of the CPSU Program. This fundamental document points out: "The CPSU is in favor of normal, stable relations between the Soviet Union and the United States, which presuppose noninterference in internal affairs, respect for each other's legitimate interests, the recognition and implementation in practice of the principle of identical security, and the establishment of the greatest possible mutual trust on this basis. Differences of social system and ideology are no reason for tense relations." It is the CPSU's conviction, the document notes, that the policy of both powers "must be oriented toward mutual understanding, not toward enmity, which is fraught with the threat of catastrophic consequences."

The Soviet Union does not lack good will. It demonstrates by means of specific actions its sincere desire to secure a turn toward broad international cooperation and to sharply lower the level of military confrontation and its businesslike approach toward constructive dialogue in Geneva and the quest for mutually advantageous accords. Vivid confirmation of that is the whole complex of bold and large-scale initiatives, including the implementation of unilateral measures, which have aroused a tremendous international reaction and have met with approval from broad circles of the peace-loving public.

The proposals put forward by the Soviet Union — banning strike space arms and reducing by 50 percent the nuclear arms of the USSR and the United States capable of reaching one another's territory — and also unilateral goodwill actions such as the moratorium on the deployment of Soviet medium-range missiles in Europe and the lowering of the number of SS-20 missiles in the European zone to the level of June of last year have met with unanimous support from the leaders of the socialist community countries. In the program document that was adopted the partici-

pants in the Sofia Warsaw Pact Political Consultative Committee conference reaffirmed the commonality of the positions of the fraternal parties and countries on the eve of the Soviet-U.S. meeting in Geneva and outlined real ways of returning international relations to the channel of detente.

In short, the Soviet side is going to Geneva for serious and productive work and is not going emptyhanded. It is no accident that many foreign observers, analyzing the Soviet peace initiatives in recent months — from the introduction of the unilateral moratorium on any nuclear explosions to the all-embracing proposals put forward by M.S. Gorbachev during his visit to France — conclude that the USSR's approach to the vital problems of our time is consistent and realistic.

Washington's Maneuvers

What is official Washington's position on the threshold of the Geneva meeting? Is the U.S. Administration prepared to travel its half of the way toward the USSR and to contribute to preventing the militarization of space and radically reducing arms on earth?

Despite the numerous assurances and declarations issuing from the White House recently regarding the U.S. desire to make the world "safer" and regarding the fact that our peoples "must live in peace," that the United States has no "hostile intentions" with regard to the USSR, and that "nuclear war must be prevented," in practice the U.S. Administration's approach to the Geneva talks can in no way be called constructive. The point is not only the tendency displayed in the U.S. ruling circles to avoid a fair solution of the most vital problems of our time by pushing them into the background, and not only the attempts to distort the meaning of the Soviet initiatives or deliberately belittle the possibility of achieving progress at the Geneva meeting. There is a clear intention to remove from discussion questions connected with the U.S. plans for militarizing outer space in the hope of using the latest scientific and technical achievements to break through into space with strike weapons and to secure strategic military superiority over the Soviet Union.

It is precisely this that is the point of the "star wars" program. And no matter what tricks the United States resorts to in order to portray the "Strategic Defense Initiative" venture as virtually a "boon" for mankind, nothing can conceal its sinister aggressive essence as part of far-reaching hopes of world domination. These imperial dreams and aspirations are shown, for instance, by a revealing remark by Edward Aldridge, Jr, U.S. under secretary of the Air Force. "There is no need to be specially imaginative," he declared, "to see that the country that controls outer space can control the whole world."

Many people inside and outside the United States note the futility of such hopes. "It is necessary to abandon the idea that technical innovations will ever make it possible to win a nuclear war or to protect a country involved in it from total annihilation," Jerome Wiesner, former special assistant for science and technology to Presidents Kennedy and Johnson and now honorary president of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, warns authoritatively. the people who are warning of the exceptionally dangerous nature of the "star wars" plans formulated by the Reagan administration also include former Pentagon boss Robert McNamara. He has noted that the program is aimed at smashing the existing equilibrium between the two countries and undermining the fundamental Soviet-U.S. accords in the sphere of arms limitation.

However, the White house, hypnotized by its "Strategic Defense Initiative" (SDI), is showing no desire to heed the insistent calls to refrain from taking a fateful step that would inevitably intensify the threat of nuclear war and would lend impetus to an uncontrolled arms race in all spheres. The U.S. Administration clearly imagines that by creating a fundamentally new type of weapons — space strike means — it will secure military superiority. Now this is an illusion. People in Washington should remember that the Soviet Union, as it warns, will be forced to offer an adequate response to the challenge that they want to throw down to it.

Describing feelings in the United States in connection with the upcoming Geneva meeting, the Indian paper *PATRIOT* recently noted: "The Soviet peace initiatives, which envisage a considerable reduction in various weapons systems, have embarrassed the United States. Certain circles in that country, chiefly the Pentagon and the CIA, resolutely oppose arms reduction. The orders linked with the SDI program have already inflamed the appetites of U.S. corporations." A similar conclusion is reached by observer J. Kraft in *THE WASHINGTON POST*. He notes that "the Pentagon leadership is taking advantage of Reagan's unclear statements to mount behind his back a systematic campaign to undermine the arms control process." It is difficult to judge how accurately this assessment reflects the situation within the administration. However, something that is bound to cause concern is the fact that on the threshold of the Geneva meeting the Pentagon has produced another forgery clearly designed to justify the U.S. course of undermining the Treaty on the Limitation of ABM Systems, to torpedo the SALT II treaty, and at the same time to denigrate the Soviet Union. I refer to the military department's report prepared by the notorious Assistant Secretary of Defense Richard Perle, which repeats invalid and unfounded claims regarding alleged Soviet "violations" of concluded treaties.

When it comes to attempts to poison the atmosphere of the Geneva meeting, hard on the Pentagon's heels is a motley reactionary army; that is, those for whom, in the words of George Kennan, formerly an eminent diplomat, "a noisy display of bellicose anticommunism is their main political stock in trade. These people," Kennan noted, "prefer us to travel the path of total war preparations, rather than that of talks on establishing arms control." Thus one right-wing organization — the "Heritage Foundation" — believing that the State Department and certain White House advisers lack, or so it claims, "the boldness to be firm" with the USSR, has prepared for the Geneva meeting a peculiar handbook which essentially calls for direct pressure and blackmail on the Soviet Union.

Historic Opportunity Must not Be Missed

Reports coming in from various countries show that such "advice" clearly runs counter to the aspirations of the peace-loving peoples, including the U.S. people, who pin on the geneva

meeting hopes that the historic opportunity to resolutely break out of the vicious circle of the escalation of the arms race will not be missed. This is shown, in particular, by the public opinion poll held by the U.S. paper *USA TODAY*. The poll's findings show that 84 percent of Americans advocate the conclusion of an agreement between the United States and the USSR in the sphere of nuclear arms reduction, and 70 percent are in favor of reaching an accord aimed at banning the deployment of weapons in space.

The movement whose participants are demanding that the administration approach the Geneva talks with the utmost seriousness and contribute to achieving positive results is now expanding in U.S. cities and settlements on the eve of the summit. President Reagan is the first U.S. president since Truman not to have signed a single important agreement on questions of arms limitation, (S. Karmel), spokesman for the Committee for National Security public organization, declared. And the U.S. people are beginning to doubt whether he really does want to lessen East-West tension as he says.

The appeal from the Washington Center for Defense Information to President Reagan to immediately follow the Soviet Union's example and establish a moratorium on all nuclear explosions has met with a wide reaction in the United States.

Many politicians, statesmen, and public figures in various countries, condemning the position that the Washington administration continues to occupy on arms limitation questions, note that whereas the peace initiatives put forward by the Soviet Union are dictated by genuine concern for security on the planet, Washington intends to extend the arms race to space. Criticism of the U.S. "star wars" program was recently voiced by French Defense Minister P. Quiles, who noted in particular that the plan for creating ABM systems envisaged by the program "does not inspire particular confidence" and will lead to an intensification of the threat of war. The president of the Board of the Social Democratic Party of Germany's Presidium has called on the participants in the Geneva meeting to abandon plans to create ABM systems with space-based elements, to freeze nuclear arsenals, and to end nuclear weapon tests.

People all over the world await effective accords on ending the nuclear arms race, reducing nuclear arsenals, preventing an arms race in outer space, and using space for peaceful purposes. This hope is expressed in a document of the UN General Assembly First Committee signed by 117 member states of the international community calling for positive results at the Geneva meeting.

The tremendous importance that the public of the whole world attaches to the upcoming Soviet-U.S. summit cogently shows that the Soviet initiatives aimed at reversing the arms race and reviving the detente process accord with the vital interests of all mankind and of present and future generations.

'International Panorama' Previews Talks

LD171939 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 17 Nov 85

["International Panorama" program presented by *IZVESTIYA* political observer Aleksandr Bovin]

[Text] The meeting is yet to start, but we are all thinking about how it will end and with what results, which is the main thing. Naturally one cannot now give a precise, 100 percent reliable answer to this question, but, all the same, let us consider this together, let us think together about various options, and let us assess the extent to which these various scenarios for the conclusion of the Geneva meeting are probable. It is said that everything that does not run counter to the laws of physics is possible. Well, from this point of view one of the possibilities is the achievement of a broad, comprehensive accord between the USSR and the United States, above all in the field of limiting and reducing strategic arms. We would like this, and I will even say: We would like this very much.

But certainly all of us — even the most gullible optimists — understand that at the present time this is, as it were, an impossible possibility. I will not even argue in detail for this thesis here, because we, all of us, without doubt pursued the course of events with interest, so that Washington's positions are well-known.

A second possibility, which is also under examination in the press throughout the world, concerns agreements on concrete, individual questions: The resumption of air links between both countries, an agreement on air traffic safety in the northern part of the Pacific Ocean, the opening of consulates in Kiev and New York, the increase of cultural exchanges, and a number of others are being mentioned in this context to give a few examples.

Talks on these questions have been held and, in principle, potential does exist here. If the interlocutors regard this as necessary — agreements of this kind are possible by way of the first steps, almost symbolic steps — why not indeed?

There is yet another possibility: it is something like a statement of joint intentions, saying that the sides will continue the contacts and will continue to discuss problems of interest to them, including at the summit level. In my view, such an outcome is a real possibility — it can be considered realistic. However, another possibility can also be considered realistic: the meeting can be concluded without adoption of a joint document. You understand, of course, that pieces of paper are not the important thing here. The important thing is that the interlocutors should somehow be able to get the measure of each other, so that some kind of mutual understanding appears, together with a desire to continue the exchange of views, to continue meetings of this kind. We will, therefore, hope, that this will come true.

Irrespective of the outcome of the Geneva dialogue, all of us, I am convinced, should adopt the following line of thought: In any event, Geneva is merely one of the links, important links, within the lengthy and complex political process, the process of attempts to put East-West relations on a steady and peaceful course. No matter what happens there, no matter what the outcome of the Geneva meeting turns out to be, we will continue this principled foreign policy course.

During a conversation with a delegation of Nobel Prize winners

in the Kremlin on Wednesday, Comrade Gorbachev said the following: Our critical times require particular wisdom in one's solutions and consideration and restraint in one's actions; they require that one does not only take one's own interests into account, but that one also takes into account universal interests.

Well, comrades, it seems to me — I would, it is true, be very glad to be wrong — that so far, Americans have been unable to overcome this intellectual barrier. They think in pre-nuclear age terms. They have not abandoned the hope to overtake us, to wreck the military-strategic parity, and to attain superiority. As an example, here is what Caspar Weinberger, U.S. defense secretary, said in Congress not so long ago, and I quote: If we manage to get a system that is effective, one that makes the Soviet Union's arms program ineffective, we will then return to a situation in which we had been when we were the only country to have nuclear weapons. In my view, you could not be clearer than that: Let us restore strategic superiority and then we can talk. Incidentally, the "star wars" program serves precisely this purpose, a program that the White House has seized upon, holding it, as it were, as if in a deadman's grip.

As you know, SDI is subjected to sharp and reasoned criticism both in the United States and elsewhere. The administration parries it as best it can, but serious arguments that it can refer to are pretty thin, so, in a manner of speaking, pawns are brought into play: all manner of comparisons, metaphors, and analogies.

For instance, Reagan quite often compares this planned strategic antimissile defense system to a gas mask or air defense artillery. But, in my view, just such a comparison reveals a weakness and vulnerability of the starting premise of the defense initiative, namely, to make nuclear missiles obsolete and powerless. And, indeed, let us just ponder this. Chemical weapons were not used during World War II, but not because gas masks had been invented and were in use: Chemical weapons had been banned way back in 1925. Incidentally, neither this ban, nor the existence of gas masks since that time have stood in anybody's way on the path from mustard gas to poisonous binary agents.

As for the air defense artillery: Its appearance has in no way diminished the role of the air force as should have been the case, according to the President's logic. On the contrary, it provided a stimulus for intensive work to further improve aircraft and make it capable of bursting through air defense cover. And, although air defense artillery has been in existence for dozens of years now, even the best antiaircraft defense plan is incapable of knocking out more than 38 percent of the attacking aircraft, if the French Institute of International Relations is to be believed. Therefore, the comparison put forward by the President does not argue in favor of his initiative, but against this initiative.

Or else, listen to what Kenneth Adelman, director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency has to say and I quote him: In the Soviet propaganda, said Adelman, on the question of the defense initiative one can often notice an interesting inconsistency. Where does he see this inconsistency?

This initiative is portrayed in the USSR as a dangerous and destabilizing fact that will be countered by Soviet countermeasures. It is, at the same time, being asserted that this initiative is useless and will turn out to be ineffective. Subsequently, a malicious question is asked: If SDI turns out to be ineffective, why is it that the Russians are so worried about it?

Well, I think the director is being malicious in vain. We are worried precisely because of the fact that it is up to us, up to our countermeasures to decisively lower the effectiveness of the antimissile defense system. And, should the need arise, we will do this without fail.

However, as has already been said hundreds of times and at various levels, we have no wish to squander our intellectual and material resources on a new round of the arms race. We have other, more important concerns and this is the first point. Secondly, we are worried that having put their trust in the absolute reliability of this antimissile defense system, in its effectiveness, the Americans may be tempted to try it out in practice. They would be making a mistake — but then, unfortunately, there will no longer be anyone left to analyze this mistake.

Thirdly, comrades, the very nature of this full-scale antimissile defense system, those minimal periods of time during which thousands of targets must be plotted, their coordinates determined and some kind of weapons of destruction sent towards them — all this must take place over tiny periods of time, minutes you can count on the fingers of one hand, if this system can be at all effective, so to speak.

That is to say, in practice, man is completely excluded from the decisionmaking. What proves to be the case is this: The question of mankind's existence is resolved not by men, but by computers. This, too, worries us.

Well, you can have different attitudes to Americans — let us say, politicans or generals — but, all the same, we do prefer to dealing with them rather than U.S. computers — even those that possess reason.

It is indeed a pity that none of this worries the U.S. Administration.

To conclude the Geneva topic, let me familiarize you, comrades, with the opinions of two Americans, or, to be more precise, with those of a U.S. male and a U.S. female. Richard Barnet, a prominent scientist and founder of the Institute for Policy Studies, writes: As for Soviet-U.S. relations, the United States has let it be understood that it would sooner squeeze [tesnit] the USSR than build a relationship based on mutual interest. It is Washington's view that it is only possible to control the Soviet adversary by steadily stepping up the threat. It seems, continues the professor, as though the administration were denying that we have any interests in common with the evil empire. The administration's approach to talks is a malevolent one and its proposals remain unacceptable to this very day. This is Barnet's view.

Here is Flora Lewis' opinion. She is a prominent U.S. journalist from *THE NEW YORK TIMES*. She writes: The President's dilemma is deeply rooted. It is a clash, on the one hand, between his anti-Russian reflex, his conviction that there can be no compromise between good, which he sees in America, and evil,

which he sees in Russia; and, on the other hand, his desire to look like a peacemaker, his promise to meet the other side halfway.

Thus, Flora Lewis and I am afraid that, all the same, the President has not managed to traverse his half of the way and this, naturally enough, will be reflected at the Geneva talks.

Bolshakov Calls for 'Wisdom' at Geneva

PM171900 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 18 Nov 85
First Edition p 6

[Special correspondent V. Bolshakov dispatch: "Time To Be Wise"]

[Text] Geneva, 17 Nov — The many-colored flags of the Swiss cantons flutter over the Mont Blanc bridge. Soviet and U.S. flags adorn the places where the participants in the summit meeting will stay. Geneva is greeting them ceremonially, with full honors.

Across the Mont Blanc bridge the road leads to the Old City. There, at 40 Grand Rue, there is a memorial plaque: "Jean-Jacques Rousseau was born in this house 28 June 1712. Everything has been preserved as it was then."

Directly opposite Rousseau's house is a newsstand with the latest issues of *LE JOURNAL DE GENEVE*. A poster on the stand says: "The Gorbachev-Reagan meeting." You can tell the importance that the people of Geneva attach to the meeting from the speed at which they buy the paper and look first at the news about the meeting. Yes, people all over the world expect a great deal of it and are hoping that it will be a spur to ensuring that mankind can rid itself of the threat of nuclear war.

The Soviet Union is prepared to do everything possible for this. And the world greatly values this. But many Western commentators misinterpret the "motives" for this Soviet "behavior." The old familiar cliches leavened with anti-Soviet allegations are still very tenacious.

Exploded Myths

It is no secret that in the last few years bourgeois propaganda, taking its cue from the Washington administration, has persistently portrayed real socialism as a system that is stagnant and ossified in its development and therefore incapable of competing with the vaunted "free enterprise," namely capitalism. The propaganda rejuvenation specialists [gospoda yuvenologi] were unscrupulous in their "arguments" and used for their own purposes even forbidden methods in their attempt to portray capitalism, which is objectively senescent, as a dynamic, spiritually and physically strong leader who will certainly defeat socialism over the marathon distance of world history.

However, one doesn't need to be a professional political scientist, one merely needs to be an objective and honest person to recognize the obvious fact: the real contrast between socialism and capitalism, between the USSR and the United States, lies in policy. "Anti-Sovietism, that ideological foundation of the arms race launched by the U.S. Administration," U.S. journalist Bruce Kimmel writes, "is rapidly losing support. More and more people are rejecting the view that the USSR represents a military threat to the United States." The reason for this, B. Kimmel believes, is the striking contrast between the U.S. and USSR approaches toward the Geneva talks and disarmament as a whole. You need only recall the U.S. Administration's offer to invite Soviet representatives to observe underground nuclear weapon tests in Nevada. The absurdity of this "initiative" was heightened by the fact that it was the U.S. "response" to the Soviet moratorium on any nuclear explosions introduced on the 40th anniversary of the bombing of Hiroshima — as of 6 August 1985. "In addition to this," Kimmel recalls, "the Soviet Union ceased the deployment of medium-range missiles in its European part, introduced a moratorium on the development [razrabotka] of antisatellite weapons, and called for a zone free from chemical weapons to be created in central Europe."

During the Soviet-French meeting, new USSR initiatives on improving the international situation were made public and radical measures in the sphere of arms reductions and regarding the prevention of the threat of world war were proposed. These proposals met with such widespread approval from the world public that people across the ocean, at first clearly dismayed and discouraged, were struck by a sudden thought and began to speak of "Moscow's clever propaganda plot" to "win the sympathies of the Western press" and "use it to attain Soviet objectives."

The ignorance about the USSR that is so widespread in the West was also displayed in the way in which attempts were made repeatedly to convince the man in the street of the existence of another "plot." Through force of habit the professional anticommunists stubbornly refused to recognize the obvious fact: that the Soviet Union is a modern, highly civilized power and it is no novelty for its leaders to have contacts with the Western press; and when Soviet representatives meet with the Western press, they do not try to imitate "Western ways" but set out our viewpoint and do so in our way.

Nevertheless, some people in the West to this day entertain the hope that we will be reborn and refashioned in conformity with the bourgeois models that have long been insistently foisted on us. They try to convince themselves — by watching Hollywood movies, by reading the repentant "confessions" of renegades, and by familiarizing themselves with dissident "revelations" created on orders from the Western special services — that a modern and civilized man cannot be a convinced communist.

However, it transpires that he can, for communism is the legitimate heir of all best things created by world civilization and mankind's advanced thought. And if people in the West took a realistic view of things, they would reach the conclusion that the present changes in the USSR are not a political phenomenon taken from outside the context of our history, but the practical result of our party's consistent implementation of Leninist principles and the ideals of the Great October Socialist Revolution. The fact that these healthy principles of our society determine its main development is what constitutes the secret of the strength and viability of Soviet power, the "enigma" of which various "sovietologists" and "kremlinologists" have been struggling to understand for decades. They often cannot see the forest for the trees, our truth for our shortcomings — which we openly and impartially discuss — or the ultimate goal for the temporary

miscalculations and blunders. So they "ascribe" to "chance," "luck," or "propaganda operations" the growing prestige of scientific communism and the Soviet Union, which in a short historical time has succeeded in surmounting age-old backwardness, reaching the forefront of world science and technology, ensuring the people's well-being and the blossoming of culture and education, and creating a mighty economy.

It is precisely on this basis that the socialist world achieved approximate strategic military parity with the West. And the leaders of the capitalist world today have, willy-nilly, to face this reality both when assessing the correlation of forces in the world arena and when talking with the USSR and its allies.

It is interesting to trace how the approach toward such talks is shaping up, particularly in the United States.

"Shoots" of Awareness

At a recent briefing in Washington, a "high-ranking White House staffer" who wished to remain anonymous said: "We recognize that there are differences between us (that is, between the USSR and the United States — V.B.), that the Soviet Union will scarcely change, that we can change nothing about this, and that the Soviet Union possesses colossal military might. It should be explained that the existence of these real differences promises competition in the future, and that both sides must ensure that this competition is peaceful. The key to ensuring peaceful competition now must be sought in the establishment of a stable military balance, in other words, of a means of arms control..."

Or take this (this is the U.S. President in his message to the country before his departure for Geneva): Despite the profound and important differences between us, we can and must prevent our rivalry in the international arena from spilling over into violence. We can find as yet undiscovered paths by traveling which U.S. and Soviet citizens can cooperate fruitfully for the good of mankind.

One cannot help noting that, by comparison with the usual rhetoric, there are marked changes both in style and in progress toward consideration of the real situation in the world.

Nevertheless, the old themes unfortunately drown out the new ones in the speeches of high-ranking White House staffers. Thus the briefing to U.S. correspondents who asked what specifically is going to be the U.S. response to the large-scale Soviet peace initiatives, and primarily to the proposal that space strike arms be banned and that USSR and U.S. nuclear means capable of reaching each other's territory be reduced by 50 percent, boiled down to arguments of very dubious worth.

Their essence is as follows: "Arms control is useless" so long as the USSR continues to support the national liberation struggle and in particular helps the liberated peoples to defend their independence and freedom and to rebuff imperialist intrigues. All this shows Washington's reluctance to abandon the customary anticommunist stereotypes and to justify its shortsighted policy by referring to the imaginary "Soviet threat." [sentence as published]

However, it was precisely on the basis of this "justification" that the present administration began an unprecedented arms race that has already cost the U.S. Treasury a monstrous sum — $1 trillion! Ehile prating about its commitment to human rights, official Washington has deprived of social assistance the more than 30 million of its citizens now living below the poverty line and has unleashed all-American persecution of dissidents and fighters for civil rights. People across the ocean have announced a "worldwide crusade for democracy" and have begun implementing a policy of state terrorism. They have proclaimed themselves champions of freedom and have begun to suppress it wherever the arm of the Pentagon and the CIA has reached, as in Grenada. They have elevated various "contras" and dushmans to the rank of "brothers of the North American democrats" and have decided with their help to implant "American-style democracy" by fire and the sword.

Crucial Choice

Practical U.S. actions show that it has still not abandoned hopes of resolving the dispute of ideas by means of force, yet nowadays this is a futile endeavor and is, moreover, exceptionally dangerous not only for those states that prefer muscle power to the power of reason but also for the entire world community.

On the eve of Geneva, the Soviet Union proposes a different path and has itself already traveled its half of that path. Our proposals both on the whole complex of problems of reducing arms and preventing the militarization of space and on the normalization of international relations as a whole are specific and realistic. The world public also expects specific and realistic actions from the United States.

What are we witnessing? A switch to more realistic positions by our partners in the talks, or an attempt by them, in the words of *THE WASHINGTON POST, "to avoid the accusation that the* United States is not serious about arms control, which would mean losing to Moscow in the battle for public opinion"?

There is no simple answer to that question. A great deal will become clearer in a few days, when the summit meeting here is over. But what is causing concern now, when there are only a matter of hours left before the meeting? Above all the clear inertia in the thinking of many Washington and NATO figures. Their reaction to the new Soviet initiatives boils down to the same stereotype: "Everything the Russians advocate is disadvantageous to the West because it is advantageous to the Russians." If only such positions were held only by incorrigible "hawks" like the Pentagon chief's famous assistant, Richard Perle, or Weinberger himself. A recent "forecast" by the latter — "the United States may breach the ABM Treaty" — caused such a rumpus in West Europe that the White House had to issue a special "reassuring statement." You can understand the U.S. allies. After all, tough statements are not only heard from the Pentagon and the U.S. President's entourage: "No concessions to the Russians on 'star wars' are planned. There will be no compromise when it comes to nuclear weapon tests..." And so on, and so forth. But what then is to become of disarmament talks? After all, talks consist in reaching accords on the basis of reciprocal steps toward each other. It is ridiculous to expect the USSR to make unilateral

concessions and to turn a blind eye to U.S. attempts to secure military superiority, including via the militarization of space. Discussion must be on an equal footing, and not otherwise. Does the United States realize that the time has come to bury the everyday myths of the "cold war" and to end preconceptions and prejudice? After all, without this it is impossible to achieve trust in relations between states and genuine security.

Shortly after the publication of M.S. Gorbachev's interview, *TIME magazine published a selection of readers' letters. Here* are two of the most indicative.

"I have begun to realize that we can no longer get away with superficial rhetoric and claim that the Soviets are intractable. We must now be prepared to get down to real business with them in order to end the threat of war.

"(D.S. Kress), Los Angeles."

Here is another letter:

"Gorbachev may be younger and smile more often, but I strongly doubt whether the Soviet Union's aggressive ambitions to control the West have in any way abated.

"Rob Hartley, Montgomery."

Both letters are written by Americans. And in a way they reflect the differences in U.S. public opinion, in the country's ruling circles, and in the administration itself — differences heightened by years of anticommunist propaganda. Mind-sets do not change instantaneously, and the Soviet Union takes this into account. But we do not believe that "cold war" prejudices and anti-communist stereotypes are fatally insurmountable.

We do not impose our view of the world on anyone. But we are confident that there is no reasonable alternative to the triumph of reason. The only things that can save mankind from nuclear madness are the will of the peoples and the wisdom of the statesmen of our time. Now is the time to be wise.

PRAVDA Reports on Lead-up to Geneva Summit

PM161745 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 17 Nov 85
First Edition p 5

[Dispatch by special correspondents B. Dubrovin and T. Kolesnichenko: "Geneva 2 Days Before the Meeting; From *PRAVDA Special Correspondents"]*

[Text] 16 Nov — Geneva, decked out in its finery, washed by fall rains, and lightly sprinkled with snow, sparkles like a picture postcard with all the colors of the rainbow. But although the Genevans, like the nearly 4,000 journalists who have come here to cover the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting, are in a somewhat exhilerated mood, you can in no way call their mood unclouded. There are reasons for that.

Above the entrance to the Intercontinental Hotel, hired for the duration by the U.S. delegation, is a large panel flashing the inscription: "Welcome to the Summit!" A picture of the dove of peace is nearby. But it was the hotel management which gave orders for the greetings and the dove of peace to be displayed. What do those who will be staying in the hotel think about it?

This is not a rhetorical question. Especially since the U.S. President is arriving in Geneva this evening. What will be the U.S. side's political baggage? It is known that the Soviet Union is doing everything possible for the successful and fruitful holding of the Soviet-U.S. talks. It is not coming to Geneva empty-handed. What about Washington?

Today we repeatedly put this question to many Western observers filling the impressive International Center building. We also tried to take a "sample" of public opinion from the local newspapers and the press of other countires, which arrived here the same day. Here is the result of this "sampling." The majority understands the tremendous importance of the Soviet-U.S. summit and is expressing the hope that it will lead to important accords on fundamental problems of the present day — the limitation of the arms race and abolition of the threat of nuclear war — and will lend a new impetus to the improvement of Soviet-U.S. relations. At the same time, not a single observer or newspaper is expressing the certainty that the U.S. side is ready to take real steps on this path. This is 2 days before the start of the talks...

As before, the White House's desire to achieve military superiority over us and to dictate its will on a global scale "from a position of strength" can now be discerned. This is manifested most clearly in the U.S. "star wars" program. As *THE NEW YORK TIMES* writes, what other name is there for the "comprehensive seven-tier system" which the United States is developing [razrabatyvayemaya] and which will consist of hundreds of satellites with weapons launched into space. What would the Americans say if this system also hung over their heads? No, it is not a "defense" initiative, but a green light to an unlimited arms race.

The Soviet Union is calling for the arms race to be halted on earth and for its extension to space to be prevented. It is characteristic that in the last days before the meeting in Geneva we have observed a blatant attempt to accuse the Soviet side in advance of some sort of backstage maneuvering on this issue, although our position is clear and is precisely set forth: Space must be an arena of international cooperation, not "star wars." One eminent U.S. television commentator came up to us in the press center foyer and asked: "Do you think it is true that the Soviet stance on research work within the framework of SDI has toughened? They say that the Soviet Union is now against fundamental research as well?" He was not the only one to ask this. Some people are evidently deliberately misinforming the public, seeking to present matters as though, as the summit meeting draws closer, the USSR is displaying increasing obstinance and — if you read between the lines — is thus preventing the Americans from embarking on a sensible compromise. What toying with the nerves and hopes of those who believe in the meeting's success!

When in his television interview, in which journalists accredited to the press center took part, U.S. Secretary of State G. Shultz recently said that "everything the United States is doing under the SDI program fully accords with the Soviet-U.S. ABM Treaty." He was sinning against truth, to put it mildly.

The same "sins" can also be discerned here in the U.S. approach toward regional problems. It can be judged by the questions put by Western and above all, U.S. journalists at press conferences now. They vie with one another in raising questions on Afghanistan, Nicaragua, Cambodia, and other countries where local reactionaries and hired CIA agents are acting against the democratic regimes and they ask: But, why does the Soviet Union not persuade the governments of the DRA and Nicaragua, for instance, to "sit down at the conference table" with the dushmans and the contras respectively?

As though the questioners did not know: First, the question of what kind of talks to conduct and with whom should be resolved by the governments of these and other sovereign states themselves. And second, with whom is it proposed that they should conduct these talks — with hired assassins and bandits who have lost their human aspect. The fact that across the ocean the Nicaraguan contras, the Afghan dushmans, the Angolan cutthroats from the National Union for the Total Liberation of Angola [UNITA] — whose leader, J. Savimbi, was a paid CIA agent and is even proud of it — the Pol Pot supporters, and others are called "freedom fighters" and "the brothers of North American democrats" does not mean they cease to be murderers and bandits. This is understood even in the United States. Yesterday *THE NEW YORK TIMES published an editorial which keenly* raised the question of U.S. interference in Angolan affairs. "To support UNITA and Savimbi," the newspaper writes, "means to encourage the Republic of South Africa in the struggle against Angola. For the Africans, Angola is a victim of the Republic of South Africa, not the Soviet Union. Helping Savimbi means helping the Republic of South Africa."

Or take the problem of the unabating Near East conflict. It is no secret that were it not for U.S. aid to Israel, there would be no piratical Israeli attacks like the ones which Tel Aviv has undertaken against Lebanon and other Arab countries. Nonetheless, Washington is continuing to pump up Israel's military muscles with ever new loans, military aid, and sophisticated murder technology. It is virtually pushing Tel Aviv toward the continuation of its policy of state terrorism. Then, it displays the "readiness" to hold secret talks on a "peace settlement" in accordance with the Camp David scenario, and to conduct them while circumventing UN decisions, ignoring the legitimate interests of all Near East states except Israel, and flouting the rights of the Palestinian people. As for the Soviet Union, in this Washington scenario it is assigned the role of a passive onlooker. The London newspaper *THE GUARDIAN* noted on the subject yesterday: "The interests of the peoples of the Near East region require (and it is to be hoped this will happen as a result of the Geneva meeting) that an end be put to the protracted attempts to isolate the USSR from the peaceful process of settling the conflict."

Yes, regional problems require solution. But for that it would be necessary for the United States above all, to stop interfering in the affairs of other peoples. And it is quite wrong to believe that regional conflicts are the main reason for the increased tension in the world. The real reason is known to everyone — it is the arms race and the U.S. course toward confrontation.

Not long before leaving for Geneva, the U.S. President said in his address to the nation that his mission "is a peace mission." Many other words were uttered about a desire for cooperation with the Soviet Union. And this can only be welcomed, like the President's statement that "the essential components of genuine peace" include "the steady reduction of these terrible nuclear arsenals until they no longer threaten the world where we have to live together." But the question is: Why did the President put these fine words at the very end of the "agenda for Geneva" which he proposed?

After all, the world expects something else: above all, a reduction, and the speediest reduction at that, of the very nuclear arsenals which the President rightly calls terrible. The world also expects the consolidation of security, the development of cooperation among the peoples, and an improvement in Soviet-U.S. relations, on which the destiny of our entire planet largely depends. The potential for this exists. It is contained in the Soviet proposal to halve the nuclear means which can reach each other's territory, on the condition that there is nonmilitarization of space. This potential is also opened up by the entire package of constructive Soviet proposals which make up a real program for normalizing the international situation and consolidating peace.

The Geneva clocks are counting away the hours remaining to the summit meeting. If the USSR's readiness to achieve tangible progress in the disarmament sphere and clear the obstacles on the paths of Soviet-U.S. relations meets with a positive response from the United States, then people's hopes will be justified. ...Then the electronic dove on the facade of the Intercontinental Hotel will spread its wings, acquiring its profound symbolic meaning.